

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

APRIL, 1936

VOLUME 18

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 7

NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

THE VIRGIN OF THE RECONQUEST OF NEW MEXICO	J. Manuel Espinosa 79
CORONADO, ONATE, AND QUIVIRA	David Donoghue 88
DOCUMENTS—LA SALLE'S OCCUPATION OF TEXAS	Walter J. O'Donnell 96
THE JUDICIARY ACT OF 1789—A STEPPING STONE IN NA- TIONAL DEVELOPMENT	John A. Zvetina 125
NOTES AND COMMENT	133
CONTRIBUTORS	136
BOOK REVIEWS	137

TAYLOR, John L. *Stoddard, Traveller, Lecturer, Litterateur*; RYAN, *The Historical Scholarship of Saint Bellarmine*; FAY, *Revolution and Freemasonry, 1680-1800*; MULVEY, *French Catholic Missionaries in the Present United States, 1604-1791*; HENDERSON, *Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War*; RYAN, *Old St. Peter's*; LANNING, *The Spanish Missions of Georgia*.

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN
WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL
PAUL J. FOIK
W. EUGENE SHIELDS

RAPHAEL HAMILTON
RAYMOND CORRIGAN
PAUL KINIERY
JEAN DELANGLEZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, \$2.00; in foreign countries, \$2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Printed in the United States. Copyright, 1935, by Loyola University.

Printed by
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

APRIL, 1936

VOLUME 18

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 7

NUMBER 2

The Virgin of the Reconquest of New Mexico

The history of Catholicism in Spanish America with all its heroic sacrifices and sufferings, its martyrdoms and glorious accomplishments is very well known. In that broad story the Spanish borderlands of North America constitute an important chapter. Especially is this true in the case of New Mexico. Although now one of the forty-eight states of the Union, New Mexico has stood like a lone sentinel on the extreme northern frontier of Spanish America, still a living part of that spiritual reality called Spanish civilization. Everywhere within its confines one meets living evidence of the blood, the language, the laws, the religion, and the traditions of Spain. In the religious tradition numerous popular customs and beliefs that are continued from generation to generation by the people constitute the fundamental elements of their religious faith. The glorious religious balladry is perhaps its most artistic manifestation.¹

An important aspect of Catholicism in colonial Spanish America was the widespread special devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary.² Countless shrines were set up in her honor. Of these many were built in memory of her aid and protection in conquest. The early records of the Spanish conquests have many references to her miraculous intercession on the field of battle. In this respect the Spanish borderlands were no exception. Among the oldest and most cherished traditions of Santa Fé, New Mexico's ancient capital, is the annual fiesta in honor of the Virgin of the Reconquest, popularly known as *La Conquistadora* and *Nuestra Señora*

¹ Aurelio M. Espinosa, "Spanish Tradition in New Mexico," *University of New Mexico Bulletin*, XLVIII, November 1, 1934, pp. 26-39.

² Constantino Bayle, S. J., *Santa María en Indias*, Madrid, 1928.

de la Conquista.³ This tradition dates from the reconquest of New Mexico by Governor Diego de Vargas in the last decade of the seventeenth century.

* * * *

New Mexico first came under Spanish domination with Oñate's conquest in 1598, a domination which lasted well nigh a century. It was a golden age of Franciscan missionary labors and a period of European beginnings—Spanish civilization had to all appearances been permanently established there. But with the bloody Pueblo Indian Revolt of 1680 everything was lost. The Spanish settlers were all driven out, and except for a handful of captives not a Spaniard remained north of El Paso. During the twelve years of Indian independence that followed virtually every trace of Spanish culture was wiped out.

Then, thirteen years later, Don Diego de Vargas, governor and captain-general of the northern province, made history by reconquering old Santa Fé and all New Mexico for the Spanish Crown and the Holy Faith. The reconquest by Vargas is a story filled with romance. In the spring of 1692 he made a preliminary expedition into New Mexico which resulted in the revalidation of Spain's claim to it and in the baptizing of 2,214 Indians. The next year Vargas returned with a large colony to effect the permanent submission of the pueblos to Spanish authority and to plant at Santa Fé what proved to be the first permanent European settlement in the Rocky Mountains area.

This second expedition met strong resistance from the natives, and Santa Fé was reoccupied only after a long and difficult siege. Encamped on the edge of the mountain just outside of Santa Fé, Vargas spent weeks sending emissary after emissary to plead with the Indian leaders to evacuate the walled city. The answer was defiance, blasphemy, and missiles hurled from the walls. Finally Vargas decided to take the fortress by storm, for the rigors of winter were fast setting in and it was a matter of life or death for the colonists, who were without shelter. On

³ Brief references to *La Conquistadora* of the New Mexico tradition may be found in Ruth L. Barker, *Caballeros*, New York, 1931, pp. 35, 181-83, 206-07; an untitled article by José D. Sena, with translations of the most important documents pertaining to the building of the present chapel of *Nuestra Señora del Rosario*, built in her honor just outside of Santa Fé, in *The Santa Fe New Mexican*, LXIX, June 30, 1933, p. 4; Ralph E. Twitchell, *The Leading Facts of New Mexican History*, Cedar Rapids, 1911-1917, Vol. II, pp. 165, 166, and his *Old Santa Fe*, Santa Fe, 1925, pp. 56, 156; Gertrude Harris, "Fiesta Time in Old Santa Fe," *New Mexico*, XII, July, 1934, pp. 7, 9, 38; Mary Austin, "Catholic Culture in Our Southwest," *The Commonweal*, VIII, October 3, 1928, p. 545; Rev. J. B. Salpointe, *Soldiers of the Cross*, Banning, California, 1898, p. 91.

December 30, 1694, following a swift and well-executed assault, the Spaniards won a decisive victory.

* * * *

On this historically significant second expedition Vargas had brought with him to Santa Fé, all the way up from Mexico, a statue of *Nuestra Señora de la Conquista*, "Our Lady of the Conquest," a portable shrine, to inspire the soldiers to retake the City of the Holy Faith from the pagan Indians. In his diary for October 13, 1693, the day of his departure from El Paso, Vargas writes: "We left for Santa Fé under the protection of Our Lady of the Conquest."⁴ Further mention of her is made in Vargas' diary of December 18, 1693, shortly after his arrival at Santa Fé. To quote:

. . . And, in order to act in everything with necessary prudence, I mounted on horseback, and with a few military officers and the Captains Francisco Lucero de Godoy and Roque Madrid, I went to examine the church or hermitage which was used as a parish church for the Mexican Indians who lived in said villa under the title of the invocation of their patron saint Michael the Archangel. And having examined it, though of small dimensions, and not for the accommodation of a great number, notwithstanding, on account of the inclemency of the weather, and the urgency of having a church in which should be celebrated the Divine Office and the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and in order that Our Lady of the Conquest may have a becoming place, I, said governor and captain-general, recognized that it is proper to roof said walls, and to white-wash and repair its windows in a manner that shall be . . . the least laborious to the natives. . . . And I also exhorted them to go with cheerfulness to said labor, and as such it really was not, to make a house for God and His Most Blessed Mother, our Virgin Mother, who was enclosed in a wagon; and that if a lady came they were obliged to furnish her with a house.⁵

According to tradition, while Vargas was at his encampment on the edge of the mountain outside of Santa Fé preparing to storm the walled city, he prayed before this image of the Blessed Virgin, asking her to intercede in his favor. And after Santa Fé had been regained he vowed that his success was due to her intercession, and ordered his soldiers to build a shrine in her honor at the camp at the foot of the mountain, and that she should be honored with a procession and a novena each year. There are various stories current among the older Spanish residents of Santa Fé regarding the nature of her miraculous intercession. One of the most widely known is the following. It is

⁴ Vargas' diary, El Paso, October 13, 1693. General Archive of the Nation, Mexico City (hereafter referred to by A. G. N.), *Historia*, Tomo 37.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Santa Fé, December 18, 1693. A. G. N., *Historia*, Tomo 39. Translated in Twitchell, *Leading Facts*, Vol. I, pp. 336-37, note 337.

said that when Vargas and his soldiers sallied forth to occupy the walled pueblo, three statues were taken along as special protectors in the enterprise: namely, a small image of the Child Christ, called *El Conquistador* (said to be the one now preserved in the museum of the cathedral at Santa Fé), a statue of Saint John (said to be in old San Miguel Church at Santa Fé), and the image of Our Lady of the Conquest. Under the protection of these holy images the Spanish host approached the gateway to the walled pueblo, and when Our Lady hove in sight, so the legend goes, the natives surrendered without resistance.⁶

Today, in the cathedral at Santa Fé, on one of the side altars there is a beautiful *Virgen del Rosario*, a statue about three feet tall, that is the special object of veneration. "She wears an azure robe, a gauzy veil and orange blossoms, and it is said that she has an extensive wardrobe in the cedar chest, often replenished by the faithful women who attend her."⁷ This *Virgen del Rosario* is called *La Conquistadora* and *Nuestra Señora de la Conquista*, Our Lady of the Conquest, and it is generally believed to be the one brought to Santa Fé by Governor Vargas, the one he gives special mention to in his diary, and the one he promised to honor.

Every year on the first Sunday after Corpus Christi the statue is carried in procession to the Chapel of Nuestra Señora del Rosario just outside the city on the site of Vargas' camp, now a cemetery. *La Conquistadora* is left there for eight days while a novena is held in her honor. At the end of the novena the statue is returned to the side altar of the cathedral, again in procession, carried by young girls in white dresses and long white veils; her path is strewn with rose petals. It is stated and believed by some of the faithful that the statue is heavier while being returned to the cathedral, and that it always rains or is at least cloudy on that day. According to the current tradition in Santa Fé this is because the Chapel of Nuestra Señora del Rosario is where *La Conquistadora* wishes to make her home.

In the early years the novena was said in the open, as only a rude shelter or grotto, made of cedar branches and cottonwood boughs, was annually erected to shelter the statue and the altar. The present chapel was built in 1806, with the exception of the auditorium to the east of it which was erected about 1913 due

⁶ This version was told by Doña Francisca Ellison, an old resident of Santa Fé, a descendant of Vargas' military captain Roque Madrid. The peaceful submission element of the story is of course incorrect.

⁷ Barker, *op. cit.*, pp. 182-83.

to the necessity of having larger quarters. The line of the procession was for many years down San Francisco Street to Rosario Street, thence to the cemetery. It was customary in olden times to erect small decorated stands along the way, at each of which the procession would halt while the priest incensed the statue and said some short prayers. At other places arches were erected, and the entire line of march was decorated with evergreens.⁸

* * * *

This New Mexico tradition is very similar to an earlier one which dates from the reconquest of Mexico City by Cortés. The Cortesian story is this:

Shortly after the first entrance of Cortés into the City of Mexico, to repeat the historical events so masterfully told by Prescott, he had seized Montezuma in his palace and carried him through the streets of the city to his own quarters, and by this daring act acquired an absolute power over him, and through him over his countrymen. It seemed that the conquest of the country was assured. But in the meantime a new danger loomed on the horizon. Diego Velásquez, the governor of Cuba, who first projected the expedition to Mexico and appointed Cortés to the chief command, became jealous of him just as the expedition was about to sail, and revoked his authority. Cortés set sail in defiance of his orders. Velásquez now fitted out a large expedition of more than thirteen hundred men under the command of Narváez, with orders to proceed to Mexico and supersede Cortés in his government. Narváez arrived in Vera Cruz about the time that Cortés had established the Spanish power in Mexico City. Cortés marched at once to Vera Cruz, where he met and vanquished Narváez at the head of his thirteen hundred men. But on the return of Cortés to Mexico, although his forces were greatly augmented by the defeat of Narváez, the dangers to which he was exposed had increased in an infinitely greater degree.

During his absence Alvarado had attacked and massacred a large number of the Mexicans whilst they were assembled at a festival. This excited the Mexicans to fury and madness; on the return of Cortés to Mexico City he found the whole population in a state of revolt. He was attacked incessantly day and night, and at last, unable to hold out longer, he determined to abandon the city. Mexico was at that time surrounded on all sides by water, and was only connected to the land by three causeways. Cortés

⁸ Sena's article, *op. cit.*

selected for his retreat that which led to the town of Tacuba. The Mexicans had taken up the bridges, and of thirteen hundred men a little more than four hundred escaped. He made his way, however, to the top of a high hill twelve miles from Mexico, where he halted and fortified himself, and in a day or two proceeded to the country of his faithful friends the Tlascalans. The night on which Cortés retreated from Mexico is to this day familiar to every Mexican as *Noche Triste*, the woeful or sorrowful night.

The tradition is that during the few days which Cortés remained on the hill mentioned he came upon a small statue of the Virgin Mary which was in the possession of one of the soldiers. The poor remnant of his army was of course despondent and broken-spirited, consequently, in that age of religious enthusiasm Cortés decided to avail himself of the little statue which had providentially, it would seem, been thrown in his way. He exhibited it to his soldiers and told them that if they would place their trust in her he knew that she would intercede for them, cure their wounds, secure for them a safe return to their Tlascalan allies, and afterwards the certain conquest of Mexico. Soon after Cortés again conquered Mexico. One of the first things which he did after completing the conquest was to build a chapel on the top of the hill to which he had retreated on the *Noche Triste*. He dedicated this to *Nuestra Señora de los Remedios*, "Our Lady of Remedies." In this chapel was placed the miraculous image, where it has been kept for nearly four hundred years. So the legend goes.⁹

When speaking of the New Mexican tradition mention was made of the popular belief that the image of *La Conquistadora* was heavier when being returned to the cathedral after the novena held in her honor at the Chapel of *Nuestra Señora del Rosario*, the explanation being that she preferred to remain and make her home at the chapel. A somewhat similar story is told by Latrobe with regard to the Cortesian tradition. He writes:

There is only one rival to her [*Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe's*] dominion in the affections of the common people in the valley of Mexico, and that is, *Nuestra Señora de los Remedios*, whose shrine is to be seen in a village near the base of the mountains to the west of the city . . . In cases of great emergency,—as during the prevalence of the cholera last year,—she

⁹ This tradition is interestingly set forth by Waddy Thompson in his *Recollections of Mexico*, New York, 1846, pp. 102-06. The account from oral tradition sticks quite closely to the historical facts as found in the early written records.

is brought with great pomp into the metropolis. On one occasion it was settled that she should pass the night in town, as the weather was unfriendly, and a suitable lodging was provided: but when morning dawned, she had vanished. The fact was, that nothing could keep her away from her flock at los Remedios, where accordingly she was found at dawn in her usual place; covered with mud, however, with having walked a number of leagues in a dark and rainy night.¹⁰

This *Virgen de los Remedios* of the Cortesian tradition was also called *La Conquistadora* and *Nuestra Señora de la Conquista*.¹¹

. . . .

It is quite possible that there is a direct relationship between the above-mentioned Mexican and New Mexican traditions, and that Vargas consciously imitated Cortés. In fact the very circumstances out of which the two traditions emerged were identical. Just as Sante Fé, the capital of New Mexico, was conquered, lost, and reconquered, so Mexico City, the capital of old Mexico, was conquered, lost on the *Noche Triste*, and reconquered. It should be emphasized, however, that any attempt to establish a relationship between the two traditions is conjectural—there were probably similar episodes during the earlier reconquest of Spain from the Moors. But the problem is worth some investigation.

The fact that *La Conquistadora* is an image of *Nuestra Señora del Rosario* in one case, and a *Nuestra Señora de los Remedios* in the other does not eliminate the possibility of relationship. Let us refer to a somewhat similar unrelated controversy. Some have attempted to prove that the original image of *Nuestra Señora de los Remedios* of the Cortesian tradition is not the one which is found today at the Church of los Remedios near Tacuba, as is generally believed, but rather another *Virgen de los Remedios* which was placed in the church of San Francisco, at Puebla, in 1530, also called *La Conquistadora*. In a volume entirely devoted to this question, Father Florencia, the seventeenth-century orator and historian, after quoting convincingly from Torquemada, Father Antonio de Santa María, and Gil González Dávila, concludes that the image at Puebla might likewise be called *La Conquistadora* without necessarily being the original one, for it might have been given that title

¹⁰ Charles J. Latrobe, *The Rambler in Mexico*, London, 1843, p. 133.

¹¹ Francisco de Florencia, S. J., *La milagrosa invención de un thesoro escondido en un campo, que halló un venturoso cazique, y escondió en su casa, para gozarlo a sus solas: patente ya en el santuario de los remedios en su admirable imagen de Ntr. Señora . . .*, Sevilla, 1745, pp. 24-31.

simply to distinguish it from others in the province, or in remembrance of some special favor in conquest.¹² In short, there was no reason to believe that only one statue of the Virgin could ever be called *La Conquistadora*.

On the other hand, it is possible that in both cases the image was originally one of *Nuestra Señora de los Remedios*. I have examined Vargas' original diaries and all of the pertinent official correspondence relating to his first and second expeditions into New Mexico,¹³ and there is no reference in any of the documents to a *Virgen del Rosario*. The only images of the Virgin referred to by name are *Nuestra Señora de los Remedios* and *Nuestra Señora de la Conquista*, both of which designations are synonymous in the Cortesian tradition.

So far as we know, no statues of the Virgin were taken to New Mexico on the expedition of 1692. But when Vargas entered Santa Fé in that year he carried a royal banner on one side of which was stamped the image of the *Virgen de los Remedios*, in whose name he asked the submission of the natives. Much is made of this image on the occasion of the submission of Santa Fé at that time, and on other occasions during the first entry. Of these perhaps the outstanding incident was that of her alleged miraculous intercession at Aguatuvi. This incident,¹⁴ one of quixotic solemnity, is eloquently described by Sigüenza y Góngora, a famous contemporary Mexican savant. He writes that after tolerating for a whole day the insults of the natives of that locality, General Vargas made a halt and forced the Indians to come up to where he was, and said to them:

"Ah Indians, ah you dogs of the worst breed that the sun warms! Do you think that my tolerance is owing to fear of your numbers? Pity is what I have had for you in not killing you, for by a single threat on my part, you would all perish! What is this, anyway! With whom do I speak? Do you still keep your weapons in your hands when you see me angered? How is it when you are Christians, though such bad ones, that, forgetting what you promised in baptism, you have profaned the churches, destroyed

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ A. G. N., *Historia*, Tomos 37, 38, 39; Santa Fé Archives, Santa Fé, New Mexico; Diego de Vargas to His Majesty, Zacatecas, May 15, 1693, in the Archive of the Indies, *Audiencia de Guadalajara*, Legajo no. 139; Irving A. Leonard, ed., *The Mercurio Volante of Don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora*, Los Angeles, 1932.

¹⁴ Diego de Vargas to His Majesty, *op. cit.*, 33. Here Vargas says: "I ordered them [the Indians] . . . to kneel down before said divine Señora de los Remedios, whom I showed to them on the royal banner, and miraculously the Virgin, Our Blessed Mother, willed that the efficacy of my faith should have such force in their breasts, and cause such due veneration, that most of them fell to their knees."

the images, murdered the missionaries, and sacrificed yourselves to the Devil to your own damnation! [How is it that] you do not humbly cast yourselves upon the ground and revere the true Mother of your God and mine who, in the image which ennoble this banner, comes with forgiveness to offer you salvation! Kneel, kneel at once before I consume you all with the fire of my indignation!"

The crash of a thunderbolt would have left them less awe-struck than these words and, having no answer to give, they laid down their arms and knelt on the ground to worship the Most Holy Mary in her image, striking their breasts many times.¹⁵

Many statues of the Blessed Virgin were carried to New Mexico on the expedition of 1693,¹⁶ in some cases, perhaps, as a result of her miraculous intercession at Aguatuvi the year before. However, during this final conquest of Santa Fé in 1693 there is not a single reference to the *Virgen de los Remedios*, so often intoned on the expedition of the year before. The only image referred to by name during this period was *Nuestra Señora de la Conquista*. Since in the Cortesian tradition *La Conquistadora* and *Nuestra Señora de la Conquista* were synonymous with *Nuestra Señora de los Remedios*, it is not impossible that the designations were also synonymous in their use in Vargas' diaries and correspondence. Furthermore, *Nuestra Señora de los Remedios* was Vargas' special protector. In his last will and testament it is written:

. . . I desire and it is my will to have five hundred masses, two hundred applied to the Holy Virgin of Remedies, my protector, for the benefit of my soul, and three hundred for the souls of the poor who died in the conquest of this kingdom and may have died up to the present day. . . .¹⁷

On these grounds the conclusion would be that the present image of *La Conquistadora* is not the original one brought by Governor Vargas in 1693, or else that it was converted into a *Virgen del Rosario* sometime since reconquest days.

Be this as it may, the history of the annual fiesta in Santa Fé in honor of *La Conquistadora* is an eloquent example of the vigor of Spanish-Catholic tradition in New Mexico, and her venerated image remains there as an eternal symbol of the faith of the Spanish *conquistadores*.

J. MANUEL ESPINOSA

¹⁵ Translated by Leonard in his edition of Sigüenza's *Mercurio Volante*, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

¹⁶ When Santa Fé finally capitulated, one of the reasons given for the execution of the rebel leaders was the breaking of a statue of the Virgin which a soldier had left in one of the houses in the villa. Vargas' diary, Santa Fé, December 30, 1693, A. G. N., *Historia*, Tomo 39.

¹⁷ Published in Twitchell, *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, Cedar Rapids, 1914, Vol. I, p. 309.

Coronado, Onate, and Quivira

"From what has been thus presented, it will be evident, I think, to the reader that . . . it is to the east and southeast of Santa Fe, to the Indian Territory and Texas of modern maps, that we must look for the scene of Spanish explorations in this [sixteenth] century; and there is no need of placing Quivira in the far northeast or beyond the Missouri as many writers are fond of doing."—H. H. Bancroft¹

Quivira has been variously located by historical writers in areas within the present states of Nebraska, Missouri, Kansas, and Texas. In the paper² published about seven years ago the writer called attention to the rather restricted area upon the Llano Estacado traversed by Coronado, as revealed by a critical analysis of the topographic descriptions found in the narratives translated by George Parker Winship.³

The Quivira-in-Kansas idea may be said to be the result of Simpson's mistranslations of the narratives and his limited knowledge of the western plains country. He assumed that the expedition went northeast from Cicuyé (Pecos) due to mistranslating a clause in Castañeda's narrative; and he then attempted to place the route within an area with which he was familiar. He placed great stress upon Coronado's assertion that Quivira was in the fortieth degree. Simpson correctly identified only two geographic features mentioned in the narratives, Cicuyé (Pecos pueblo), and the Río Cicuyé (Pecos River) as the point to which the army returned after taking leave of Coronado at the ravines in the plains.⁴

Those writers who followed Simpson had at their disposal more accurate maps and perhaps better translations, and they saw that Simpson's route was impossible; yet many retained the Quivira-in-Kansas idea. They apparently had little personal first-hand knowledge of the country, and were wont to assume that flat plains extend all over the western parts of Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, and that Coronado crossed from five to thirteen rivers when only two river crossings are mentioned in the narra-

¹ *The History of the North Mexican States*, Vol. I, p. 391.

² David Donoghue, "The Route of the Coronado Expedition in Texas," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XXXIII, 1929, pp. 181-92.

³ George Parker Winship, "The Coronado Expedition, 1540-1542," *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution*, Washington, 1896, Part I, pp. 329-637. See also his "Journey of Coronado."

⁴ J. H. Simpson, "Coronado's March in the Search of the 'Seven Cities of Cibola,' and Discussion of Their Probable Location." In *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution*, 1869, Washington, 1871, pp. 309-40.

tives. One historical authority takes Coronado over the Wichita Mountains; another speaks of the "gypsum stretches of the Llano Estacado"; some place ravines where there are no ravines; and all substitute rough red-bed topography with its salt and gypsum and "bitter water" for country which was so level that "even if a man only lay down on his back he lost sight of the ground."

A summary of the various narratives is given below, omitting everything except the essential geographic and topographic details. Vivid descriptions of the plains are common to all the narratives. Only Castañeda and Jaramillo mention the ravines in the plains from whence Coronado went to the north and the army returned to the river Cicuyé. The army's return is described by Castañeda. Jaramillo and the *Relación del Suceso* mention the river "below Quivira." The description of Quivira is almost wholly that of Jaramillo, as is the route of the return from Quivira. A remarkable fact is that Coronado himself gave little information regarding the "province they call Quivira." The plains, "these deserts," are what impressed him.

From Cicuyé the entire army marched four days to the River Cicuyé "which flowed down *from* towards Cicuyé," built a bridge, and in ten days more passed a Querecho village near the western edge of the plains. After thirty-seven days the army entered the ravines "like those of Colima." Here Coronado with thirty men on horses (and six on foot?) went north or northeast for forty-two or forty-eight days, crossed the river "below Quivira" on St. Peter and Paul's day (June 29), went down the north bank to the northeast and after six or seven days came to the settlements, which were on rivers without much water, which flowed into a larger river; through this area they travelled for four or five days, and then came to a river which was the end of Quivira.

For the return journey guides were obtained, who, says Jaramillo, ". . . brought us back by the same road as far as where I said before, that we came to a river called St. Peter and Paul's and here we left that by which we had come, and, taking the right hand, they led us along by watering places and among cows and by a good road, although there are none either one way or the other except those of the cows, as I have said. At last we came to where we recognized the country, where I said we found the first settlement, where the Turk led us from the route

we should have followed. Thus, leaving the rest aside, we reached Tiguex. . . ."⁵

The army returned from the ravines over the plains by way of the salt lakes to the River Cicuyé at a distance of "more than thirty leagues" below the bridge, thence up to this structure and into Cicuyé.

It is only necessary to find an area that has not "a stone nor a bit of rising ground, nor a tree, nor a shrub, nor anything to go by;" with a river on the west over which a bridge was built; with ravines in the plains, to the east; with a river running to the northeast, to the north of the ravines; and north of this river other rivers or creeks on which the Quivira settlements were built; and then another river, the end of Quivira.

Regardless of how many days or the number of leagues that Coronado and his followers estimated they travelled, these are the physical limitations of their journey. The Río Pecos is the Río Cicuyé, the ravines are the Palo Duro and Tule Cañons, and the Canadian River is the river "below Quivira." Along the creeks entering the Canadian and along Wolf Creek and its tributaries the settlements of Quivira were found. The flat plains certainly end at the North Canadian. The army returned to the Río Pecos at a point in the vicinity of Fort Sumner (Bosque Redondo).

The writer's efforts have been to point out definite topographic features that exist today and to show that the striking descriptions in the narratives apply to these features alone.⁶ Should some be inclined to reason that the expeditions of

⁵ This quotation is from the narrative of Jaramillo and is the only definite statement found in the Coronado narratives regarding the route of the return journey from Quivira. If Jaramillo's descriptions of the route from the ravines to the river "below Quivira," and to the rivers on which the Quivira settlements were located are accepted, then this statement regarding the return journey must be given prime consideration. Some writers assert that the return journey from Quivira-in-Kansas was along "that ancient Indian highway, the Santa Fe Trail." It is hardly necessary to point out that this solution of the problem is merely a bewildered attempt at an explanation by those whose arguments have led them into an untenable position.

⁶ For descriptions of the plains in Texas Panhandle, and in adjoining regions in Oklahoma, see: Charles N. Gould and John T. Lonsdale, "Geology of Beaver County, Oklahoma," *Oklahoma Geological Survey, Bulletin* 38, August, 1926; also in "Geology of Texas County, Oklahoma," *Oklahoma Geological Survey, Bulletin* 37, April, 1926. Charles N. Gould, "Geology and Water Resources of Oklahoma," *U. S. Geological Survey, 1905, Water Supply Paper* 148; also in "Geology and Water Resources of the Western Portion of the Panhandle of Texas," *U. S. Geological Survey, Water Supply Paper* 191, 1907; also in "Geology and Water Resources of the Eastern Portion of the Panhandle of Texas," *U. S. Geological Survey, Water Supply Paper* 154, 1906.

Coronado and Oñate penetrated into a more distant area in Kansas or Nebraska or Missouri, and to base their argument upon the number of days of travel, the distances given, the geodetic positions mentioned,⁷ and even on something so remote as modern archaeological and ethnological studies, it must be admitted that there are statements in the narratives to support such an opinion.⁸ But, there is one consistent description in all

⁷ The arguments based on these subjects are best summarized in the following: James Newton Baskett, "A Study of the Route of Coronado between the Rio Grande and Missouri Rivers," *Collections of the Kansas State Historical Society*, 1912, Vol. XII, pp. 219-52. This paper calls attention to several mistranslations which were the cause of various misconceptions regarding the location of Quivira, the most misleading of these being a clause regarding the river first crossed after leaving Cicuyé and over which the bridge was built, which clause Winship translated to read, "which flowed down towards Cicuyé" instead of "which flowed down from towards Cicuyé." Rev. Michael A. Shine, "The Lost Province of Quivira," *The Catholic Historical Review*, April, 1916, Vol. II, pp. 3-18. This paper argues for the location of Quivira in Nebraska. Charles W. Hackett, tr., *Pichardo's Treatise on the Limits of Louisiana and Texas*, Vol. I and II. Pichardo suggests an obviously impossible location for Quivira in the vicinity of Nacogdoches in East Texas. J. V. Brower, *Memoirs of Explorations in the Basin of the Mississippi*, Vol. I, *Quivira*, Vol. II, *Harahey*. In *Harahey*, pp. 58-73, are Dr. F. W. Hodge's ideas regarding the route of Coronado after leaving Cicuyé, except the return from Quivira which he does not mention at all. Dr. Hodge states that Coronado turned north at some point near the Colorado River in Texas between longitude 99° and 100° (that is, in the vicinity of Coleman), and marched slightly west of north to the Arkansas River near Dodge City, Kansas. He fails to note the barrier of the Wichita Mountains which had to be crossed or gone around. It is also interesting that Dr. Hodge states that Dr. Robert T. Hill verifies his conclusions (p. 62, note 3), and quotes Dr. Hill's opinion (p. 63) that "... the Spaniards in all probability travelled as far as the extreme upper Nueces ..." More recent opinions of Dr. Hill are as follows: *Dallas Morning News*, June 16, 1935, Section 3, p. 9. A sketch map shows the route as then interpreted by Dr. Hill to have been east from Pecos, down the Red River to a point east of the 100° meridian, apparently about 99°. A loop to the south to the Colorado River is shown, probably to indicate the explorations made from the "ravines." Coronado's march to Quivira is suggested as crossing Red River along a path that would take him over the Wichita Mountains, *ibid.*, September 22, 1935, Section 3, p. 17. Dr. Hill now says "... the Canyon of Red River in northern Cooke County, which as I have recently discovered, was the second ravine of Coronado's travels," *ibid.*, October 6, 1936, Section 3, p. 17. Dr. Hill in discussing the Indians of the plains says, "... the details of the Indian Camp in Palo Duro Canyon were the same in the times of Coronado and Mackenzie." The difference in latitude between the head of the Nueces River and the "Canyon of the Red River in northern Cooke County" is about four degrees. This variation in ideas over a period of forty years as to the geographical location of one of Coronado's trail markers does not appear to be very large until it is realized that the distance is about three hundred miles, but even allowing for this adjustment in viewpoint, the route still does not place Coronado within the confines of plains "with no more landmarks than if we had been swallowed up in the sea."

⁸ The latest support to the Quivira-in-Kansas theory is based on flimsy evidence supplied by "certain spots of extremely rich soil" identified as the archaeological remains of grass lodges presumably standing at the time of Coronado's alleged visit and occupied by the Quiviras or Wichitas! See, Warren King Moorehead, *Archaeology of the Arkansas River Valley*, New

the narratives and that is of the flat, the level, the monotonous plains, and the writer attaches the greatest importance to these realistic accounts of the Llano Estacado and its remnant north of the Canadian, and to Castañeda's picture of the ravines in the plains, the Palo Duro and Tule Cañons.

OÑATE'S EXPEDITION TO THE EAST

The narrative and the map of the Oñate expedition published by Bolton⁹ confirm in many particulars the route of Coronado and the interpretations that the writer has made. As with the Coronado narratives distances and number of days of travel and the evidence of the map as to the geodetic positions have been given little or no consideration in the face of the definite statements both in the narrative and on the map that the plains were level. A note on the map states: "From the point 'A' to the pueblo of the new discovery all the land is level with many cows, which they call Cívola."¹⁰

The Oñate narrative says: ". . . the land was so level that daily the men became lost in it by separating themselves for but a short distance from us. . . ." From the narrative and the map the following itinerary of the expedition has been built:

The start was made on June 23, 1601, from San Gabriel. (The map shows San Gabriel on the west bank of the Río Grande below the mouth of the Río Chama and above the pueblo of Santa Clara.)

The party travelled four days to Galisteo, where five or six days were spent preparing for the march. It then proceeded, taking five days to go to Río Buenaventura, one day to Río Bagres, and three days to Río Magdalena (or Madalena). The expedition travelled along the Río Magdalena and entered the level plains of Cíbola. On August 2 it came to the Río de San Francisco and on San Lorenzo Day (August 10) the party began to see the buffalo. Having travelled one hundred eleven leagues (two hundred ninety-four miles), they found it necessary to leave the Magdalena River on account of sand dunes appearing ahead. Turning to the north "we travelled up a small stream until we discovered the great plains covered with innumerable

Haven, 1931. This paper discusses ruins in the Texas Panhandle, along the Canadian River, Wolf Creek, and other streams.

⁹ Herbert Eugene Bolton, *Spanish Exploration in the Southwest, True Account of the Expedition of Oñate toward the East, 1601*, pp. 250-67. The map, p. 212, is from the original manuscript map in the *Archives of the Indies, Seville*.

¹⁰ Translation through courtesy of Dr. Carlos E. Castañeda.

cattle." There were some large ravines and broken hills but the land was in general level and very easy to traverse (the map shows direction to have been to the northeast). The expedition crossed and followed along "two small streams which flowed towards the east." They then came to a small river with much timber (the map shows the two small streams uniting to form the small river with much timber, the Río de Robredal). From here they travelled three leagues to another river (the map shows this river uniting with the Río de Robredal). Then they went three leagues to a large *ranchería* whose people were at war with others settled eight leagues distant towards the interior (the map designates the *ranchería* as Escanjagues). They then proceeded seven leagues to a river with good fords and deep pools flowing east (the map shows the direction of the march to have been towards the north). Four leagues farther, they met a war party of Indians. They then went to the Río San Francisco which they crossed and advanced one-half league to a *ranchería* on the banks of a river which flowed into the larger one. They marched three leagues through a populated district. Up to this point they had travelled two hundred twenty leagues (five hundred eighty-three miles). The return to San Gabriel took fifty-nine days, or until November 24, 1601.

The map shows only one branch at the head of the Pecos, but the Río Buenaventura is probably the Pecos, and the Río Bagres the Gallinas. The Río Magdalena is certainly the Canadian. The stream mentioned as having been reached on August 2 and called Río de San Francisco is Ute Creek, judging from its position on the map. The second stream shown on the map as flowing into the Magdalena below the Río de San Francisco but not mentioned in the narrative, is probably Mustang Creek (Río Blanco).

The expedition left the Río Magdalena and turned to the northeast on account of sand dunes appearing ahead. Sand dunes are found along the Canadian in eastern Hutchinson County, Texas, and extend downstream beyond the Oklahoma line.¹¹ It might be remarked that the distance of one hundred eleven leagues (two hundred ninety-four miles), from San Gabriel to the sand dunes is almost exactly that which a map measurement gives. It was in this area, where the Canadian flows to the northeast, that the writer placed the crossing of the river "below

¹¹ There are sand dunes along the Canadian in other areas in the Texas Panhandle; see Gould, *op. cit.* Those in Hutchinson County are located along the Canadian where it runs to the northeast.

Quivira," as described by Jaramillo. The "two small streams which flowed toward the east" and the next river crossed, are branches of the Río de Robredal (River of Oak Groves) on which the Escanjaques village was situated and this can only be Wolf Creek and its tributaries upon the remnant of the Llano Estacado north of the Canadian.

The streams seven leagues north of the Escanjaques settlement, including the second Río de San Francisco, are probably the North Canadian (Beaver Creek) and some of its branches.¹²

In the writer's first paper he limited the location of Quivira to an area immediately to the north of the Canadian and along its small tributaries in the counties of Hutchinson and Roberts. With the aid of the Oñate narrative and map he has proved that the Canadian is the river that flowed to the northeast "below Quivira," that upon Wolf Creek in Ochiltree County was located some of the settlements of Quivira, and the "end of Quivira" coincided with the end of the flat plains at or near the North Canadian, or perhaps one of its tributaries, in Beaver County, Oklahoma.

DAVID DONOGHUE

¹² Bolton identifies the Río Buenaventura as the Pecos, the Río Bagres as the Gallinas, and the Magdalena as the Canadian. These identifications I believe to be correct. He then states that the sand dunes where Oñate left the Magdalena were the Antelope Hills. The Antelope Hills are not sand dunes, and their distance from San Gabriel is about three hundred eighty miles (one hundred forty-five leagues), and they are not in the level country. The "two small streams that flowed to the east" are identified as Beaver Creek (North Fork) and Cimmaron River. Apparently Bolton considers that these two streams are not shown on the map. Then he says that the stream seven leagues north of the Escanjaques village was the Arkansas near Wichita, Kansas, and that "the two streams crossed just below were branches of the Ne-Ne-Schah as is clear from the Martínez map, where the second is called Río de Robredal." That Bolton failed to correlate the narrative and the map is evident. The "two small streams that flowed toward the east" are clearly shown as the western branches of the Río de Robredal, and they could not be the Beaver Creek (North Fork) and the Cimmaron, for these streams unite with the Canadian and the Arkansas respectively in eastern Oklahoma two hundred fifty miles or more east of the Texas line. Between the Antelope Hills and Wichita, Kansas, are to be found the well-known rough, red-bed, salt, gypsum and bitter water country which is not mentioned in the Oñate narrative, and the Canadian River, Beaver Creek (North Fork of the Canadian, or North Canadian), Cimmaron River, Salt Fork of the Arkansas, Medicine Lodge River, Chikaskia River, Ninneschah River, Arkansas River, and numerous creeks. If Bolton is correct in his interpretation of the narrative, then we must conclude that Oñate neglected to mention three of these rivers and the numerous creeks, and the map maker neglected to sketch in five large streams and the numerous creeks on the map he compiled.

DOCUMENTS

La Salle's Occupation of Texas¹

San Francisco de Coahuila, May 18, 1688. I, General Alonso de León,² Governor, and Captain of the Presidio in this Province, make the following official report: I have just returned to this pueblo from a military expedition against some Indians who had rebelled against the Royal Crown. I have punished all those taken in the skirmish. Before going on this expedition, I sent Agustín de la Cruz, a Tlaxcaltecan, to gather as many friendly natives as he could to go with me on this expedition. He did not arrive in time to effect this purpose.

Upon my entrance into this pueblo, I found Agustín, who gave me an account of what had happened to him. He said that he had gone to the other bank of the Río Bravo to see if he could assemble some nations for the purpose above mentioned. On a *ranchería* he came upon a lodge, built in the form of a large hall, and roofed with buffalo hides. As soon as he had approached, the Indians who were around this lodge made him dismount and enter. They forced him to kneel to talk with the man who was within the hall. He saw, somewhat distant from him, a person who was tall, very white, and who seemingly was a Spaniard. He was seated on a throne draped with buffalo hides. He appeared to be about fifty years old. His hair was gray, and his face was painted with stripes in different parts (after the fashion of the Indians) who held him in great veneration. For this reason Agustín paid him the highest respect and courtesy. Agustín spoke to him in his maternal Indian tongue; the man did not answer him at all, but appealed to one of the Indians who was present to act as interpreter. Thereupon, out of cour-

¹ The documents here presented are taken from *Autos Y Diligencias q se an Executade p.º el Capº Alonso de leon gouº de la prouº de Coaguila en la nª Spª sobre el descubrimº de Vna poblazon de franceses q se dijo hauia en el Seno Mexicano Y de la aprehenzion de tres dellos Y lo obrado sobre toto. A. G. I., Audiencia de México*, 61-6-20 (Dunn Transcripts, University of Texas). With the exception of the letter of Alonso de León of April 22, 1689, which was printed in Spanish by Buckingham Smith in *Documentos para la Historia de la Florida*, none of the others have heretofore been published in English or Spanish. The memoir of Monsieur Thevenot [Thevenot] is likewise taken from *Copia de relacion hecha al Rei Zpmo tocant a la vahia del Spiritu as.º qye remitio el S.º Dº Pedro Ronquilla Embax.º de su Mg.ª en inglaterra al Conde de la Monclova mi S.º en carta fha en Londres a 7 de febr.º deste año de 1687. A. G. I., Audiencia de México*, 61-6-20 (Dunn Transcripts, University of Texas).

² Autos of Alonso de León, May 18, 1688, *A. G. I., Audiencia de México*, 61-6-20 (Dunn Transcripts, University of Texas).

tesy, he replied that he was a Frenchman; that some time ago he had come into this region to muster some Indian nations of this territory to fight the hostile tribes who did not want to unite with him. He said that he was sent of God to establish villages, and, that to me, General Alonso de León, he had sent Indians to urge me to come with a friar to see him. To Agustín he gave six natives to escort him as far as the village, La Caldera. These Indians are now with me and will serve as guides when I make the journey. The Frenchman took from Agustín the arquebus which he was carrying. This he did as a pledge that he would return. Agustín informed me of these facts, that with them in mind I might make suitable arrangements to carry out my own plans.

It is recognized that this Frenchman, who, perhaps, is encouraged by some one of his own nation, has the sole desire of reconnoitering, with the Indians whom he has now assembled and with the others whom he is trying to attach to himself, all of this land and the posts that are in it; of seeking the opportune moment in which to advise his fellow countrymen to send a troop of soldiers so that they with the Indians whom he has assembled will attack these towns and destroy them. This would not be an impossibility, because we have very few forces with which to put up any resistance.

In this province there are only twenty-five soldiers, and a few citizens from among those who have come to set up a new foundation on this frontier. Should the attack be sudden, we shall not be able to get aid from the Villa of Saltillo, from the Valle of Parras, nor from the Nuevo Reino de León, because although bordering upon this frontier, they are too far distant from us. To avoid this danger and the evil consequences that will flow from it to the other provinces of New Spain, which would suffer an equal fate and would be taken possession of by the hostile Indians as well as by this Frenchman, I believe it necessary to apply the most efficacious and direct remedy. Therefore I ordered the eighteen most experienced and best-armed men to be mustered for the purpose of finding and apprehending the Frenchman. Meanwhile, this pueblo will be garrisoned by the other soldiers and by the people whose names are not on the roll.

Since there is no notary in the province, I, together with two witnesses, have signed this *auto*.

Alonso de León

Joseph Antonio de Ecay y Músquiz

Carlos Cantú

On this said day, month, and year (May 18, 1688) I, General Alonso de León, carrying out the foregoing *auto*, called the roll. It was made up of all the officers and soldiers sent to me from Nuevo Reino de León by General Francisco Cuervo de Valdez, Governor and Captain General of Nuevo León, and of my brother's sons and relatives who had come to aid me in the military exploits of this province.

On this day we set out, following a course to the northeast. After traveling forty-two leagues, we crossed the Río Bravo. Continuing to the northeast for about fifteen leagues, we met about five hundred Indians who were killing buffaloes in order to make "jerked" meat. On approaching them, I asked them through an interpreter: "Was there a Spaniard in these parts?" Pointing toward the northeast, they told me that there was a Spaniard about five or six leagues away. "He was," they said, "their leader and ruler, and him they obeyed." I told one of them to guide us to this Spaniard. He led us to the dwelling—a journey of some five or six leagues, and twenty leagues from the Río Bravo. In the distance we saw the pueblo, which was on high ground. We saw also some three hundred Indians grouped around like a bodyguard. Arriving at the door of a large hall which was made of buffalo hides, we met with forty-two Indian sentries, armed with bows and arrows.

On entering, we found the hall clean and very well swept. Opposite the door were three seats of buffalo hides, cleansed and combed. On the center seat sat the Frenchman of whom Agustín de la Cruz, the Tlaxcaltecan Indian, had given me an account. I recognized him from the description given of him as mentioned in the report. On the seat were buffalo hides fashioned into cushions; there were two Indians, apparently of importance, standing, one at either side. When the Father Chaplain, Fray Buenaventura Bonal of the Order of St. Francis, General Martín de Mendiondo, and I had come near him, the Frenchman arose from his seat, knelt, and kissed the scapular of the Franciscan habit. To me and to the General he extended his hand with much courtesy. Immediately placing his hand on his chest, he said repeatedly: "I am French"; thereby giving us to understand that he belonged to that nation. "How many are you?" he asked me in Spanish. I answered that we were many, and that a larger number remained behind as a rearguard, but near this place. These answers left him, as it were, confused and undecided.

At this moment I carried into effect the precaution which

I had taken of bringing with me cloth, skirts, sleeveless shirts, knives, earrings, beads, rosaries, and tobacco with which to win the devotion of the Indians. Having taken out these articles, I gave them to the Frenchman, so that he personally might distribute them among the Indians. This he did. While he was doing this, he noticed—a fact that I observed—that our soldiers were on horseback, for only three of us had entered into the hall, the friar, General Martín de Mendiondo, and I. The Frenchman knows very well the native language of the Indians with whom he is associated. I talked with him in the Mexican language through an Indian interpreter. I told the interpreter to tell him that he had to come along with me as far as the Río Bravo, where there was a Frenchman who would speak to him in his own tongue, and we could consult as to what was best to do. From there he could return to his own lodging.

This idea he resisted very much, and so did the Indians who were with him. Noting this opposition, I realized that to bring him by force would be a very serious and dangerous undertaking, because it would endanger my whole company. Since there were more than a thousand Indians armed with bows and arrows, who could make an attack upon us, I gently and politely urged him to come with me. Although he objected constantly, we succeeded through tact and skill in getting him out of the room in which he was. By doing so, we placed ourselves in open danger.

The Indians waited on him with much obedience, respect, and veneration; they knelt before him, and in his lodging fanned him with fans made of feathers; they wiped the perspiration from him, and spread the hall with deer's tallow and with other things unknown to us, and kept it covered with leafy branches. These tribesmen were now drawn up in military ranks with captains at their head, and were very alert. We saw in the hall an arquebus which, although broken, must have been as long as a musket. We observed also a powder-horn, a ramrod, and shot. Having been asked his name he said: "My name in Francisco. I am a Catholic. In my own language I am called Captain Yan Jarri. I am going about assembling many Indian nations to make them my friends; those who do not wish to join me, I attack and destroy with the aid of my Indian followers."

Whereupon, although, as I have said, he and his Indians were unwilling to go with us, we placed him upon a horse, much to his own grief and that of the natives. The Indians I again made

happy by distributing to them the remainder of the things that I had with me, and by giving them to understand that our taking him away was neither to molest him nor to harm him, for neither he nor they had ever done anything against the Spaniards. He himself had sent for me, and the viceroy and the bishop wanted to see him, to speak with him, and to present him with gifts because they already knew about him. The Indians were appeased, and with the prisoner we set out on the journey to this pueblo of San Francisco de Coahuila.

In order to continue with the investigations which this case demands, I, with two witnesses, have signed my name to this *auto*.

Alonso de León
Joseph Antonio de Ecay y Músquiz
Carlos Cantú

DEPOSITION OF THE FRENCHMAN, FRANCISCO, ALIAS YAN JARRI³

San Francisco de Coahuila, June 7, 1688. I, General Alonso de León, Governor, and Captain of the Presidio in this Province, arrived at this pueblo today with the French prisoner as mentioned in the preceding *auto*. Thinking it necessary that its content ought to be made clearer and more detailed, and that we ought to find out with certainty whether it is true that the French have a settlement, as is said, on Espíritu Santo Bay or on one of the rivers which flow into the Sea of the North, I ordered an Indian, Ignacio by name, skilled both in the Mexican language and in Spanish, to come before me. He is a native of Caldera, a pueblo in this province. He is to act as interpreter in the examination of Francisco, the French prisoner, who is here present.

Accordingly, Ignacio swore by our Lord and by the sign of the cross to tell truthfully whatever Francisco, the Frenchman, would say. Likewise, Francisco swore to tell the truth about what he knew of those matters about which he would be asked. We put to him the following questions: "What is your name? Where were you born? What is your office? Of whom are you a subject? What reason did you have for joining the Indians among whom we found you? By what route did you come? At whose command? How long are you with the Indians? How old are you? Are you married or single?" He replied that Francisco was the name which was given him in baptism, but that his fel-

³ Declaración de Francisco, alias Yan Jarri, A. G. I., Audiencia de México, 61-6-20 (Dunn Transcripts, University of Texas).

low countrymen called him Captain Yan Jarri. It is a fact, he said, that he is captain of a company in his own nation. He is a native of San Juan de Orleans in the kingdom of France. Having learned the language of the Indians, he came hither at the command of Monsieur Phelipe, Governor of a settlement which the French have made on the banks of a large river. Before coming to this territory he had already reduced many Indian nations, who were in the immediate neighborhood of the above-mentioned settlement.

The motive in reducing all these nations is to make them subjects of the King of France. He was married in the settlement and has a little girl. About three years ago, he said, he united with these Indians. He does not know his age; from appearance he seems to be over fifty years old. Questioned as to how long ago the French made the settlement on the river mentioned above, the number of families, the number of ships, their pretext for coming, since they knew that all this land belonged to the King of Spain, he answered, largely through signs, that the French made this settlement about fifteen years ago. He did not know how many families there were, or in how many ships they had come. On the banks of the river there are two forts, one opposite the other. The larger and the better belongs to the French. It has twenty pieces of artillery, five on each side. The other fort belongs to the Flemish. The French and the Flemish communicate with one another by crossing the river in canoes, for each nation has its fort on its own side of the river. The Flemish have no artillery; they have some blunderbusses. The settlement of the French is very well garrisoned; the fort guards and defends the four streets in the settlement. There are six companies of soldiers. The settlement has a church and a Capuchin convent with six priests. The church is well built. It has a tower with ten bells. In the harbor there are ordinarily three merchant ships which sail to and from France. They bring them everything that is needed. Asked if around the settlement there were any farmlands, horses, cows, and sheep; what crops they raised, and whether the Indians helped them to sow and to harvest, he replied that all around the settlement there were farmlands which were planted in maize and in wheat; of these cereals they raised enough for their sustenance. There were, also, cows, sheep, horses, mules, and a mill in which they ground the wheat for the people of the settlement. They also raised a great deal of tobacco and sugar cane. All this work they did

with the help of the Indians who had surrendered to their government. To go by water from the settlement to the coast they had seven boats with oars and sails. They made the distance in one day, and in three days they could make the trip on horseback. To the question: "Of what material are the forts built?" he answered that they are made of stone and mortar. The stone they brought from the coast.

Questioned as to whether the Frenchmen from the settlement had ever come to visit him during the time that he was with the Indians among whom we found him; whether he ever went to the settlement to visit them; on the occasions that the Frenchmen came to visit him, what did they talk about; and why did they come, he answered that, from the time he joined the Indians among whom we found him, he had never returned to the settlement. About a year ago, sixteen Frenchmen came to see him to find how things were going with him in his reductions. This was all that they talked about. To the questions: "Is the settlement on level ground? Is the surrounding country level, rolling, hilly, marshy so that access to it is difficult?" he replied that the whole country is level, and presents no difficulty to anyone coming to the settlement. The country is very well suited to farming. He did not know whether there were any springs or creeks which irrigated the farmlands.

The foregoing are the questions that were put to him by the interpreter. Under oath he stated that he did not know anything else. After his deposition had been read to him, he affirmed it and ratified it. He did not sign it because he does not know how to write. For the same reason the interpreter did not sign it. I, the Governor, signed the deposition together with two witnesses,

Alonso de León

Joseph Antonio de Ecay y Músquiz

Carlos Cantú

San Francisco de Coahuila, June 7, 1688. I, General Alonso de León, having read the deposition of the French prisoner, Francisco, alias Monsieur Yan Jarri, and also all the *autos* pertaining to this case, believe that there arises from these *autos* the certitude that the French have a settlement on the river or bay, Espíritu Santo. Therefore, I have ordered that these *autos* and the prisoner be sent to His Excellency, Conde de la Monclova, Viceroy and Captain General of New Spain, and President of the Real Audiencia, so that, after a study of the *autos*, he may

decide what is best to do, and that he may place on this frontier all the protection necessary to offset whatever may arise from the imprisonment of the Frenchman and the tumult which it may possibly cause among his Indian followers. With two witnesses I have signed this *auto*.⁴

Alonso de León

Joseph Antonio de Ecay y Músquiz

Carlos Cantú

THE ROUTE AND DIARY OF THE MILITARY EXPEDITION WHICH I, GENERAL ALONSO DE LEÓN, MADE WITH A COMPANY OF SOLDIERS, TO APPREHEND THE FRENCHMAN.⁵

Wednesday, May 19, 1688. We set out from San Francisco de Coahuila, and spent the night at the juncture of the two rivers, Nadadores and Coahuila. The road is good, and smooth. The distance traveled was six leagues.

Thursday, May 20. We passed through a place which is called Los Baluartes. We went down the River Nadadores. Distance seven leagues. The land is level and productive (*cómoda*).

Friday, May 21. We crossed the River Nadadores and spent the night on the Sabinas River. Distance ten leagues. There are running springs, and the land is level and fertile.

Saturday, May 22. We had to stop in order to round up the horses.

Sunday, May 23. We travelled seven leagues, and camped at a little lake. The road is good.

Monday, May 24. We camped on an *arroyo*, at the foot of a large hill. The land is level and abounds with water. Distance, eight leagues.

Tuesday, May 25. We set out to find the Río Grande. Four leagues from the point at which we set out, we came upon the river. Total distance from San Francisco de Coahuila to the Río Grande, forty-two leagues.

Wednesday, May 26. On the Río Grande we pitched camp and left there five soldiers. With thirteen soldiers and the chaplain we crossed the Río Grande. The ford was wide and easy. The water reached to our stirrups. The width of the river was about the distance of two shots from an arquebus. Fording the river is not dangerous. Cattle can cross it. We spent this day on an

⁴ *Auto* of Alonso de León, June 7, 1688, A. G. I., *Audiencia de México*, 61-6-20 (Dunn Transcripts, University of Texas).

⁵ A. G. I., *Audiencia de México*, 61-6-20 (Dunn Transcripts, University of Texas).

arroyo where there are some small lakes. The land is level and abounds in water and in pasturage. The distance from the Río Grande is eight leagues.

Thursday, May 27. The Feast of the Ascension of Our Lord. We camped on another *arroyo* which is in a mountainous ravine. We travelled this day eleven leagues. The land is level. There is much water. Distance, eleven leagues.

Friday, May 28. Not having any news from the Frenchman, I sent some Indians to hunt for the *ranchería* on which he lived. This day I spent in camp.

Saturday, May 29. One of the Indians returned, saying that he had not found the *ranchería*, and that we should return to the river to await news. Whereupon, we retraced the road that we had travelled yesterday. We stopped at the *arroyo*. On the road we encountered more than five hundred Indians who were killing cattle which they call *cibola* (buffalo). These animals resemble very much our cattle. We made inquiries of the Indians about a Spaniard who was with them. They told us that he was on a *ranchería* very near this place and that he was their master. We helped them to kill some of the buffaloes. One of the Indians guided us almost to the *ranchería*. There we spent the night. We travelled about three leagues. The direction in which we have been traveling every day has been in the northeast.

Sunday, May 30. We forded five *arroyos*. Because of the high water the passage was difficult. Having crossed the *arroyos*, we saw in the distance the *ranchería*. It is on high ground, and is distant three leagues from the place at which we spent last night. Total distance from San Francisco de Coahuila, sixty-seven leagues.

Having taken the Frenchman, we set out on the following day over the same route by which we had come. We arrived at the pueblo of San Francisco de Coahuila on June 6. Although it appears from the diary that the distance from San Francisco de Coahuila to the *ranchería* is sixty-seven leagues, it actually is sixty-two because we must subtract the five leagues that we doubled back, Friday, May 28.

That these facts may always be known, I have signed my name to this *auto*.

Alonso de León

I, General Alonso de León, Governor of the Province of Coahuila and Commander of the three companies of soldiers, who have come with me to discover the settlement which the

French are said to have made on Espíritu Santo Bay, am now, April 22, 1689, in the neighborhood of this bay.⁶ Having carried out the orders which His Excellency, Conde de Galve, Viceroy, Governor and Captain General of New Spain, and President of the Real Audiencia, has been pleased to send me, I make the following report:

Through the will of God and by prudent speed, we arrived today, April 22, 1689, at the settlement founded by the French. I have ordered camp to be pitched at a place nearby, which lies close to a deep *arroyo*. In so far as we have observed, this stream flows into the bay. It has high and low tides, and its water is salty. From our camp we have not seen any people there. Consequently the rumor is current among the natives whom we have seen on this expedition and with whom we have talked through an interpreter, that it seems certain that the Indians from the seacoast have killed the inhabitants of the post. Since it is necessary to examine the settlement closely to see if the French have a fort, to learn its size and that of the houses, and to bring back whatever other information I can obtain, so that I can give a detailed account of His Excellency, the Governor of New Spain. I saw to it in the first place that no officer or soldier should dare to go to the location before I had examined it thoroughly. Therefore, with the Major, the Captain, and other officers from the three companies of soldiers, I entered the place. We counted six houses. The one nearest the *arroyo* is very solidly built of stout ship-timber. It has four rooms, is roofed with planks, and is about two and one-half *varas* high. As a protection from the rain, the roof is gabled so that the water flows off in two currents.

Near this fort is a one-room building constructed of the material mentioned above. In order to keep out the rain the roof is covered with buffalo hides. All of us believe that this building must have been used as a chapel. Toward the south are two more houses, and toward the west are two more; a small hut faces the *arroyo*.

After we had entered the fort and all the houses, we found that they had been plundered. Everything that was in them was ruined and destroyed. The doors were broken; pots, drawers, bottles, tables, and all the utensils were smashed into bits; not a

⁶ Estando en Sercania de la Vaia del espiritu santo en viente y dos mes de abril de mil ss^{as} y ochenta nueve años. (Report of Alonso de León of April 22, 1689), *A. G. I., Audiencia de México*, 61-6-20 (Dunn Transcripts, University of Texas).

single thing did we find that was of any use. Furthermore, in the *patios* of these houses we came upon many books and manuscripts that were written in French—a fact that we learned from the *alférez*, Francisco Martínez, who knows French very well.

Scattered around the fort and the houses were eight iron cannons (five- or six-pounders); and three very old swivel guns, which lacked their bases. In the *patios* we found a hundred broken stocks of arquebuses from which the barrels and locks had been removed by those who had stormed the settlement. At the fort and the houses we saw also thirty-two iron cannon balls—some of eight and ten pounds, others larger. There were also a few large nails and some small iron rods. In none of the houses was there anything of value. I ordered the men to collect all the iron. The total weight was about two hundred and fifty pounds.

Near the settlement was a picket fence, which enclosed about two hundred *varas* of ground, where they sowed maize. Close to one of the houses we came upon three dead bodies. From the dress that was still clinging to one of the bodies, we recognized it as that of a woman. We buried them, covering the bones with earth. The five houses, made of paling and roofed with buffalo hides, resembled *jacales* and were entirely useless for any kind of defense whatsoever. The reason for the use of this material is that stone suitable for building purposes was not available except from a great distance. I testify to all these facts. I gave orders that all the iron be collected so that we can bring it to the Province of Coahuila. In whatever way it is most convenient we shall dispose of the eight cannons and the swivel guns.

That these facts may be known always, I have ordered that they be set down in this *auto*. Since we do not have with us a notary, I have signed this *auto* with two witnesses.

Alonso de León

Witnesses: { Francisco Martínez
Juan Bautista Chapa,

THE DEPOSITION OF THE FRENCHMAN, JUAN ARCHECUQUE
[ARCHEVEQUE]⁷

On May 1, 1689, in the camp on Our Lady of Guadalupe River, I, General Alonso de León, Governor of the Province of Coahuila and Commander of the three companies of soldiers who have come with me to discover Espíritu Santo Bay and the

⁷ Declaración de Juan Archecuque [Archevêque], A. G. I., Audiencia de México, 61-6-20 (Dunn Transcripts, University of Texas).

settlement established by the French, make the following report:

I wrote a letter to some Frenchmen who, it was said, were going to the Tejas Indians. On the day on which I arrived after discovering the bay, I received an answer to the above-mentioned letter. In this communication they told us to wait for them. Only two of them would come because the other two were far distant, although they had sent them word to return. Because of their delay in coming, I set out with thirty men to hunt for them. On a *ranchería* I found two of the said Frenchmen together with a Tejas Indian. All three I brought to this camp.

Since it was possible for me to take their depositions in legal form, I inquired: "Of what country are they natives? Who brought them to this territory? What was their purpose in coming?" And in order to question them on everything that would be of moment to His Majesty and of aid in discovering their designs and motives in establishing a settlement on Espíritu Santo Bay, I ordered one of the Frenchmen to appear before me. He said that his name is Juan Archecuque [Archevêque] and that he is a native of Bayonne in the Kingdom of France. The *alférez*, Francisco Martínez, because of his thorough knowledge of French, acted as interpreter.

In the first place, I received from Juan the prescribed oath, which he made in the proper form, in the name of God and the sign of the cross. Under oath, he promised to tell the truth about everything on which he would be questioned. Accordingly, I asked him to tell with whom and when he came to this territory. He said that he came here about five years ago with his cousin. There were four ships in charge of Monsieur de Salle—whose Christian name he does not remember. This only does he know, that they came by order of the King of France to people these parts, and that he [the witness] came on one of the ships. The ships were loaded with provisions.

Among the ships was one from the Royal Armada. Monsieur de Salle's purpose was to discover the first settlement which already had been established on a river on the other side of the bay. Having searched for three months, they were not able to find its location. Of the four ships only the smallest entered the bay, and the one from the Royal Armada rode at anchor two leagues out at sea from the bay. The third ship was lost at its entrance, and it was said that it had been stranded intentionally. The fourth ship their enemies captured off the coast of the Island of Santo Domingo. The small ship (which he gave us to

understand was a frigate) was anchored in the bay for some seven or eight months and was destroyed by a storm that came out of the north. Of all the people who were aboard only six escaped. With some two hundred and fifty persons, more or less, Monsieur de Salle peopled the spot on which we discovered the fort and the houses. He landed eight or nine cannons and three or four swivel guns. Of those who made up this settlement, one hundred soldiers were paid by the king, the others were volunteers. They must have had three hundred large guns; and each man had two carbines. In addition, there were four large boxes of firearms and about one hundred and fifty barrels of powder. All the men had swords or cutlasses. The frigate, which belongs to the Royal Armada and which rode at anchor off the coast, returned to France after the above-mentioned arms had been deposited in the settlement. Monsieur de Salle, who was at the post, decided to go on foot to the Tejas Indians, with twenty men armed with arquebuses, so that he could from there go to Canada. Because of the harsh treatment that he gave the people, some of them died. Monsieur de Salle returned to the settlement with the survivors. They brought with them five horses loaded with maize, which was distributed for planting so that the people could sustain themselves.

Later, Monsieur de Salle built two canoes in which he went to discover the river on which the first settlement had been established. Not being able to find it, he returned in the canoes to this settlement.

On account of serious difference which an English gunner had with Monsieur de Salle, the Englishman killed him. This event took place while they were on their way to Canada. After the death of Monsieur de Salle, his brother, who is a priest, a Recollect religious, a pilot, and two French secular priests went from this new settlement to the Tejas Indians. This witness is of the opinion that if these men who went to the Tejas Indians cross or have crossed to Canada, they will advise the King of France to aid this post. Their purpose in settling the place was to traffic in buffalo hides, tallow, and lard. In the region in which Monsieur de Salle had located the people, there was much Brazil-wood, in which they also wished to carry on trade. On the seacoast near the same river, Monsieur de Salle set up as a landmark a large cross bearing the arms of the King of France.

Asked what had become of the people in the place which we discovered, the witness said that most of them died from over-

work, and that the Indians had killed the survivors, some four or five months ago. To the questions: "Why had he and others left the settlement? Where had he been during this time?" he replied that the brother of Monsieur de Salle had sent them to Canada to bring back people. Having become sick, they remained with the Tejas Indians. Among those slain by the Indians who killed the inhabitants of this settlement were the two Recollect friars and a secular priest. The witness knows that this is a fact, because he was already on his way from the Tejas to see his companions. When they had arrived at the settlement, they saw the ravage that had taken place. They buried the dead whom they found, and they set fire to the powder.

Having been asked whether his companion had gone with him and had returned with him, he answered that the two of them always went together. Questioned as to whether he knew how many rivers flow into the bay, he said that he did not. Under oath he declared that he knew nothing beyond what he had declared.

After the *alférez* had read to him his deposition, the witness confirmed and approved it. He said that he is twenty-nine years old. With me and the *alférez* and two witnesses, he signed the deposition.

Alonso de León

Juan Archecuque [Archevêque] of Bayonne
Francisco Martínez

Witnesses: { Juan Bautista Chapa
 { Francisco Ramírez

DEPOSITION OF JAKES GROLE^s

I at once ordered the other Frenchman to appear before me, that I might take his deposition. Through the aforesaid *alférez*, Francisco Martínez, I received the oath which the Frenchman took in the name of God and the sign of the cross. He promised to tell the truth in all things about which he should be interrogated.

Having been questioned according to the tenor of the preceding deposition, he said that his name was Jaques Grole, that he was a native of Rochelle in France, and that he was the son of Christian parents. The witness said that he had left France with

^s Declaración de Jaques Grole, A. G. I., Audiencia de México, 61-6-20 (Dunn Transcripts, University of Texas).

a Monsieur de Salle, some four or five years ago, on one of four boats. The purpose in coming was that Monsieur de Salle should establish a settlement in Canada, which he had previously visited. Monsieur de Salle came at the command of the King of France. Having arrived on these shores, they set out to find the place that they were seeking. They should have located the place within ten days, but they failed to find it in a search that lasted for two months. Consequently, they set out to hunt for the Bay of Espíritu Santo.

The largest ship, which was of the Royal Armada, anchored near the coast, and a hooker was lost on a reef at the entrance of the harbor. For two days the ship was grounded, and they were unable to free her. The people from the other ships helped them to remove from the vessel whatever could be saved. From the wood they built a house on the seashore.

The frigate, because it was small, was able to enter the bay. Later, in a storm that blew from the north, it was destroyed in the same bay. Afterward, this witness took soundings there. Because of the shallowness, no ship could navigate except a galley, or a small boat, or a very small frigate. The bay has many sand reefs, and is twenty leagues long and fourteen leagues wide.

This settlement which we have discovered, Monsieur de Salle had peopled with two hundred and fifty men, of whom one hundred were paid by the king. The frigate which was lost carried four brass cannons—six-pounders—and six iron cannons. The ones which we found in the post were those from the first ship that was destroyed. There were also three swivel guns, four hundred arquebuses, and two boxes of pistols. Some of the soldiers had cutlasses, others wore swords. Although much of the powder carried by the ships was lost, they landed one hundred and fifty barrels.

With twenty men Monsieur de Salle set out from this place to find the first settlement, which had been established on a river. He was not successful in finding it; some of the men took sick, others died, and only six remained with Monsieur de Salle. They returned to this post with five horses loaded with maize, which they received from the Tejas Indians. With this maize they made their first planting.

This witness was one of those who went with Monsieur de Salle. He and two others became sick. To this witness they related that Monsieur de Salle had set out again from this settle-

ment to hunt for the other one, and that an English gunner had killed him. Being among the Tejas Indians, this witness had heard this from the priest-brother of Monsieur de Salle, and from two other religious and secular priests, who passed through the Tejas territory.

Asked what was the motive in founding the settlement, he replied that they established it to traffic in buffalo hides, buffalo hair, and in other things. Questioned as to how many Frenchmen there are today among the Tejas Indians, he answered that at present there are only three men and a boy, and that the brother of Monsieur and the others had gone to Canada. He does not know that they arrived there, for the rumor is that they have been killed. Coming some days later to see his fellow-countrymen who were in this settlement, this witness and his companions found that the Indians had killed them and had robbed them of everything that they had. This ravage this witness saw. They found fourteen dead bodies, which they buried. The selfsame Indians told him that natives from the coast are holding captive two young girls and three boys. Rumor, however, has it that they slew one of the girls. Questioned as to why the Indians had not carried off the powder, he replied that he and his companions had burned it. Asked if he knew how many rivers flow into the bay, he said that there were only four, and that at the mouth of a large river on that side of the bay that looks toward Vera Cruz, Monsieur de Salle, before leaving, had erected as a landmark a large cross bearing the arms of the King of France.

This witness states under oath that he has told the truth. After the *alférez* had read to him his deposition, he confirmed it and ratified it. He said that he is twenty-eight or thirty years old. Not knowing how to write, he did not sign the deposition. With the aforesaid *alférez* and two witnesses, I affixed my name.

Alonso de León

Francisco Martínez

Witnesses: { Juan Bautista Chapa
Francisco Ramírez

In the pueblo of San Francisco, Coahuilla, May 16, 1689. Having examined the two preceding depositions, I, General Alonso de León, Governor and Captain of the presidio of this

province, do now send them to his Excellency, Conde de Galve, Viceroy and Captain General of New Spain, in order that he may use them as he shall see fit. To this *auto* I sign my name together with the two witnesses.⁹

Alonso de León

Witnesses: { Juan Bautista Chapa
 { Joseph Antonio de Ecay y Músquiz

In the city of Mexico, on June 10, 1689, Licenciado Don Francisco Fernández Marmolejo of His Majesty's Council, Oidor in the Real Audiencia, and Auditor General de la Guerra, made the following statement:¹⁰ Since General Alonso de León, Governor of the Province of Coahuila, by order of His Excellency, the Viceroy of this New Spain, has gone overland with people to discover the settlement which the French are said to have on the Gulf of Mexico; and since through his labors there resulted the capture among the Indians of two Frenchmen whom, guarded by the *alférez*, Francisco Martínez—a person very skilled in the French language—he has sent onto this city; and since Alonso de León, through the *alférez*, has taken depositions from these Frenchmen in order to know and to find out whatever he could about the settlement, His Excellency, Conde de Galve, has charged me, the Auditor General de la Guerra, to have these Frenchmen make again under oath, by means of questions and cross-examination, depositions concerning the above-mentioned investigation.

Carrying out these orders, I, along with the two captains, Don Andrés de Pez and Juan Enríquez Barroto, and the *alférez*, Francisco Martínez, who has been appointed interpreter and who has solemnly sworn on a cross to fulfill his office of interpreter to the very best of his ability, commanded one of the Frenchmen to be brought before me. Through the interpreter I asked: "What is your name? Are you a Catholic?" He replied: "My name is Juan Archecuque [Archevêque], and I am a Christian, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman." In the presence of the notary and through the aforesaid interpreter, I received his oath which he made in the name of God and the sign of the cross, swearing to tell the truth in everything about which he should be questioned.

⁹ Remisión, A. G. I., *Audiencia de México*, 61-6-20 (Dunn Transcripts, University of Texas).

¹⁰ Declaración de los franceses en México, A. G. I., *Audiencia de México*, 61-6-20 (Dunn Transcripts, University of Texas).

Questioned as to whether he had made, in the Province of Coahuila, a deposition before General Alonso de León, he replied that he had. After the interpreter had read to him the deposition mentioned above, he said that it is the same as the one which he had made at that time and which he is now going to make, because it is the truth. To the questions: "In what place and by what people was the smack captured which was being convoyed by the other three ships? What cargo did she have?" he answered that the smack was captured off a cape or point of the Island of Santo Domingo. Conveyed by the other ships, this boat, having sprung a leak, anchored. The enemy arrived (he knows neither the fleet nor the nation), captured the ship, and by fastening a cable to it, carried it off. This vessel, because it was small, had a crew of only eight men and the commander. It was loaded in La Rochelle, from which place they set out to make this voyage. The cargo was wine, brandy, flour, and clothes.

Having been questioned whether they followed the shores of Florida after they had entered the Gulf of Mexico, and thus skirted the coast, how much time did they spend from the moment that they came to the Cape of Florida to the time that they entered the river on which they made the settlement, what is the name of the river, or what name did they give it, he answered that from the coast of Florida they at once began to seek the latitude which Monsieur de Salle had in mind. In order not to go beyond this latitude they anchored every night, and it is his opinion that in ten days they reached the latitude that Monsieur de Salle was seeking. Into no harbor or river did they enter until after they had gone beyond the mouth of the river, up which they went a distance of about five leagues to make a settlement. He does not know the name of this river. This witness was in a launch. As they were setting out, the boat sprang a leak, and they were on the point of losing their lives. Neither with the bay through which they entered nor with the land on which they made the settlement were they acquainted. They named the place San Luis.

Having been asked what the name of the bay or river on which Monsieur de Salle had left the people of the first settlement and for which he was seeking, and what was its depth, he replied that Monsieur de Salle came to seek, not a bay, but the Mississippi River, where he had left the habitation and where he had erected as a landmark a cross bearing the arms of

France. Since they did not come upon the place, he does not know what depth the river has, nor did he ever hear Monsieur de Salle mention it.

Having arrived at the place through which they entered to make a settlement, the French captain of the King's ship went on shore with an astrolabe. Having unloaded the arms, he told Monsieur de Salle that his orders were to leave him at this place. This he did.

To the questions: "What is the name of the King's captain who came as convoy and who made a landing? How many leagues did he travel from the place at which he disembarked? Did he have with him an engineer and good pilots?" he replied that the captain's name was Monsieur Beaugeu [Beaujeu]. He does not know just how far the captain travelled overland, but he is informed that the captain on a land journey discovered some small islands. Not finding the site that he was looking for in order to establish a settlement, he did not want to remain. He, together with a priest who was also unwilling to stay, returned in the King's ship. These went back to France. The captain brought pilots with him. One of these, a young man twenty-two years old, was very good. The Indians killed him.

Having been asked how deep was the water at the entrance of the bay and where did they make a settlement, he said that at the entrance of the bay the water was eleven feet deep—a little less than two *varas*; farther in, it was nine feet deep, and in places, less deep. Questioned as to whether some persons died from sickness after they had settled in San Luis, he answered that some suffered from hemorrhages, but that he neither saw anyone die nor learned that anyone had died after the settlement had been established. Those who perished were two or three Frenchmen whom the Indians killed with arrows. This happened while the King's ship was still there. Later, many persons met death from the harsh treatment given them by Monsieur de Salle. They succumbed from overwork and from long exposure in the water.

To the question: "How long was the captain of the King's convoy on that coast before he returned to France?" he replied that, if one reckons the time that the captain was in sight of the bay where the launch was lost, and the time that he was at the place where the boat sprang a leak and where he landed and disembarked the people, it would be about two months. Having been asked whether the captain of the convoy brought with him,

on his return to France, some natives from that coast, he replied that the captain did not bring any Indians, but that Monsieur de Salle, on returning to France from the Mississippi River, took an Indian with him. Monsieur de Salle brought him back with him from France. The Indian disembarked with the Frenchmen at the spot on which they made a settlement. Going overland with Monsieur de Salle to find the post on the Mississippi, the Indian died.

Questioned as to how many ships, large and small, they had after Captain Beaugeu [Beaujeu] of the King's ship returned to France, he answered that, with the frigate and its shallop that had entered the bay, they had four or five canoes, some of which the savages gave them, and others they took from them by force. To the questions: "From the time that Monsieur de Salle landed at the settlement, and from the time that the King's ship returned to France, how long did he search for the Mississippi? And how long did it take him to discover that he had not found that river?" he replied that for about a year Monsieur de Salle made various attempts to find the Mississippi. Convinced now that he was near the Mississippi, he decided to go by land to Canada, so that, from there, he might find the Mississippi by going over the land which he had traversed when he came to the settlement for the first time. With nineteen persons, among whom were his brother the priest, a discalced Franciscan, and an English gunner, Monsieur de Salle travelled sixty leagues inland. Because of the harsh treatment that he had received from Monsieur de Salle, the Englishman, catching Monsieur de Salle off guard, killed him by shooting him in the head with an arquebus. This witness saw the body with the bullet in the head.

Then Monsieur de Salle's brother, the discalced friar, a pilot, and others continued the journey with the hope of reaching Canada. On account of sickness, this witness and four other Frenchmen remained with the Tejas Indians, who are by nature gentle and good; the rest scattered. This witness received word that one was drowned, others died, and the Indians killed the remainder. Among those slain was the Englishman who had shot Monsieur de Salle. The Tejas Indians also told him that, fifty leagues inland, the savages had massacred the discalced friar and the others who were on their way to Canada. Monsieur de Salle's death occurred about two and a half years ago.

To the questions: "Who was in charge of the settlement, San Luis, during all the time that Monsieur de Salle was absent?

Did this witness return to it after the death of Monsieur de Salle? Who was in charge of the settlement up to the time that the Indians killed the inhabitants?" he replied that, when Monsieur de Salle left the settlement to seek the Mississippi, he left in charge of San Luis a Captain Barbier. This witness does not know who was in charge of the settlement at the time that the Indians killed the people because he never returned to it. He remained with the Tejas nation until the Spaniards took him away.

To the questions: "At the time that he set out with Monsieur de Salle and during the time that he stayed with the Tejas Indians, were there in the settlement the same houses that he saw there upon his return, after the settlement had been laid waste and all the Frenchmen killed? Did the Frenchmen sow maize every year? Was the crop sufficient to support them? On what did they live?" he answered that upon his return to the settlement, San Luis, after his departure with Monsieur de Salle and after Monsieur de Salle's death, there was one more house. This last year they had planted a little maize on ground enclosed by a picket-fence. At the time that the Frenchmen were killed by the Indians, they had not harvested the maize. After the supplies that they had brought from France had been exhausted, they lived on buffalo meat and on wild turkeys, which they used to hunt at night. Having been asked why he and his companion stayed with the Tejas Indians, and why they permitted their faces to be painted, he answered that their reason for staying with the Tejas was that they were one hundred leagues from the settlement; not knowing the road, they did not dare to come alone because of the hostile tribes who infested the route. Importuned by the men and women, they permitted their faces to be painted. They thought it necessary to do this in order to please the Indians who were caring for them and supporting them. Their return to the settlement came about in this way: The Tejas nation was desirous of taking this witness and his present companion and two other Frenchmen who were also with the Indians to visit the Umanes [Jumano] Indians among whom they said lived a friar. Moved by their Catholic instinct, they set out to hunt for him. When he, the witness, and his companions had arrived near the settlement and had recognized the road that led to it, they wanted to see how things stood with their countrymen. They asked the Indians to allow them to go alone. But, since these Tejas loved them very much and had aided them in

their wars, they accompanied them on their journey. This quite suited this witness and his companions because, after they had come to the ruined settlement and had set fire to the powder, they had no recourse other than that of returning with the Indians and of living with them. This they did until the Spaniards, through the mercy of God, learned of their whereabouts and brought them hither. Knowing that there were Spaniards with some Indians of the Umanes nation [Jumano], this witness wrote two letters to Coahuila, in which he informed the Spaniards that there were in those regions two French Catholics and that the Spaniards should take them away so that they can live among Catholics.

On being asked whether he met, face to face, a Frenchman who was painted like the one who went with Captain Alonso de León to discover this settlement; was he acquainted with him in that settlement; did he speak with him; of what nation was he; and did he know how he came into that region in which he was found, he answered that, although he had met him face to face and had spoken with him, neither he nor his companion knew anything more about him than the name of the town from which he came. They did not know how he came to be in the territory in which the Spaniards captured him. He had told them that he was from Xebalu in France. Since they have never heard of any such place in France, they regard it certain that this place is in New France, and that it is the first settlement which Monsieur de Salle established and which he later was unable to find. To this Frenchman, whose name is Juan Xeri, there must have happened that which befell both this witness and his companion. He must have left his settlement, which was destroyed as ours was, and after wandering among the various Indian nations, have come into the territory in which the Spaniards discovered him.

He declares under oath that what he has said is true. After the interpreter had read to him his deposition, he confirmed it and ratified it. He said that he was twenty-nine years old. With the interpreter, the Captain Don Andrés de Pez and Juan Enríques Barroto, and the Auditor General, he signed the deposition.

Juan Parchucogue (sic) [Archevêque]
Don Francisco Fernández Marmolejo
Francisco Martínez

Andrés de Pez
Juan Enríquez Barroto
Sebastián Sánchez de las Fraguas, *Notary*

Immediately, the Auditor General, with the help of the interpreter, received the oath made by Jaques Grole,¹¹ the other Frenchman, whom General Alonso de León had sent hither. In the presence of the Auditor General, the present notary, and the two witnesses, Juan Enríquez Barroto and Captain Andrés Pez, the Frenchman made his deposition. Declaring that he is a Roman Catholic, the witness promised in the name of God and the sign of the cross to answer truthfully the questions that should be put to him.

Asked whether he had made to General Alonso de León in the Province of Coahuila the deposition which the interpreter had just read to him *de verbo ad verbum*, he answered that he had, and that he made it exactly as it has been read to him. Because it is the truth, he now ratifies it. Since he had been present during the examination of his companion, Juan Arco-bispo [Archevêque], he was asked whether he had understood all the questions and answers contained in this man's deposition. He replied that he understood everything, that the answers to the questions were true, and that he concurred in the deposition which his companion had made. Despite the fact that this witness says that he has understood everything, the Auditor General ordered the interpreter to read the deposition slowly to see whether the witness had anything to add to it or subtract from it. After the interpreter had read the deposition *de verbo ad verbum*, the witness, Jaques Grole, said that he had nothing to add or to subtract. Everything in it is true, and he confirms and ratifies it on oath. He said that he is twenty-eight years old, more or less. He did not sign the deposition because, as he said, he does not know how to write.

Licenciado, Don Francisco Fernández Marmolejo
Francisco Martínez
Juan Enríquez Barroto
Andrés de Pez
Sebastián Sánchez de las Fraguas, *Notary*

¹¹ Declaración del otro frances, A. G. I., Audiencia de México, 61-6-20 (Dunn Transcripts, University of Texas).

OPINION OF DE PEZ AND BARROTO¹²

Mexico City, June 12, 1689. Before the present notary and witnesses appeared the Captains, Don Andrés de Pez and Juan Enríquez Barroto. I certify that I know them. They have come, they said, in obedience to the orders given by His Excellency, the Viceroy, on June 11, 1689. His Excellency wishes them to give their opinion on the diary which General Alonso de León wrote about the discovery of the settlement which the French are said to have on the Gulf of Mexico. Having read carefully the depositions of the two Frenchmen which were taken by General Alonso de León and which were sent by him to this city, and also the depositions made by the Frenchmen in this city before the Auditor General, who is now present, they give their opinion as follows:

The bay which the Frenchmen call San Luis and which the Governor, Alonso de León, believes to be Espíritu Santo, is the one which we, in the voyage of discovery which we made from Vera Cruz in 1687, call San Bernardo. The entrance to the bay has an elevation of Polaris, 28° 23', and the northern side has 29°. On this bay, toward the northeast, four leagues from the mouth of the bay, we saw, along with many pieces of wreckage, the small ship that had been lost and which these Frenchmen refer to as having been of from fifty to seventy tons. In the diary of this voyage of the *piraguas* which was sent to the Royal Council of the Indies, one will find these facts under the date April 4.

Together with this diary we sent to the Royal Council of the Indies a brand-new map of the entire Gulf of Mexico. On this map one can see this bay, and can see also, marked with the words "Navio quebrado," the exact spot on which this ship was lost. Under the dates April 2, 3, 4, and 5, one will note that the soundings which we took at the entrance of the bay and over its wide area agree with those given by the Frenchmen in their depositions. At the entrance of the bay the water is two fathoms deep; that is, its depth is more than eleven French feet. Inside the bay the depth is four and five feet, and near the shore less. The remainder of the bay is so shallow that it can be navigated only in small boats. The same diary will show that, being in two canoes which we picked up on the Río or Bahía de Flores, eight or nine leagues off San Bernardo Bay, we came upon the wreck-

¹² Parezer de Pez y Barroto, A. G. I., *Audiencia de México*, 61-6-20 (Dunn Transcripts, University of Texas).

age of the *Pingue*. Hence we infer that when, as these Frenchmen say, the ship had been lost at the mouth of the bay (for we know very well that a ship of two hundred and fifty tons could not enter the bay), the Indians along the coast picked up in their canoes some of the arms and amunition and brought them through the channels that connect these lakes with the Río de Flores. Because these facts can be proved both from the diary and from the map of the voyage, we are not going to enlarge further our proof. Skilled and experienced pilots, we have given this evidence to the very best of our ability. We have sailed the Gulf of Mexico, and we have been, as we have said, in the Bay of San Bernardo. As additional proof they confirmed their deposition on oath made in the name of God and of the cross, and signed it together with these witnesses, citizens of Mexico.

Joseph de Ansietta

Gregorio Alonzo

Antonio de Ubiedo

Andrés de Pez

Juan Enríquez Barroto

Sebastián Sánchez de las Fraguas, *Notary*

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.—The following memoir on Espíritu Santo Bay is a copy of the one written to the King of Spain by Don Pedro Ronquillo, Spanish Ambassador in England. The Ambassador sent the report to Conde de Monclova, Viceroy of New Spain. The date is: London, February 7, 1687. In Mexico City, July 22, 1687, the Viceroy presided at the reading of this report to the naval and military captain, Don Pedro de Yriarte, and the pilots, Juan Enríquez Barroto and Antonio Romero. Their running commentaries I place in the footnotes.¹³

Four or five years ago, Monsieur Theunot [Thevenot] published a memoir on the voyage of Padre Marquet [Marquette], the first Frenchman who sailed the Mississippi. The river flows from north to south a distance of seven or eight hundred leagues and empties into the Gulf of Mexico between the Magdalena River and Espíritu Santo Bay on the coast of Florida. After this discovery, La Salle, a nominal cavalier, the son of a blacksmith in Rouen, went to Canada to seek his fortune. He had studied with the Jesuits and taken the habit, but left at the end of two years. Although Father Marquet [Marquette] had given him entrée to the Jesuits in Canada, with whom he lived seven or

¹³ Copia de relación hecho al Rei Xpmo tocante al la Vahia del Spiritu ss^{to} que remitió el S.^{or} D.^a Pedro Ronquillo. . . . A. G. I., Audiencia de México, 61-6-20 (Dunn Transcripts, University of Texas).

eight years, La Salle was always at odds with the Jesuits. This fact led him to attempt voyages of discovery.

With eighteen or twenty men, Frenchmen and Indians, La Salle went down the river in three or four canoes as far as its supposed mouth. The men who were with him are certain that he did not find salt water and that he mistook for the sea what was only a lagoon or a large body of water separated from the sea by a reef. This sandbank encloses the waters of the lagoon. The rivers, flowing from the mainland, enter the sea through channels made by these rivers as they course through the lagoon in much the same way as the Rhone is said to do in traversing Lake Geneva.

Toward the end of the year 1684, La Salle came to France about this pretended discovery of the mouth of the Mississippi. He found a great welcome with Monsieur de Seygnalay, to whom he presented a map marked with latitudes and longitudes that would make plausible his proposals. On his word they believed in him and in his map. He made them believe what he wanted them to believe. He offered to build two forts on the banks of the mouth of the river if they would equip him for his undertaking. By building these forts, he would prevent everybody from entering the river to take the treasures that were there. He convinced everyone except the Jesuits (whom he held as enemies) and Monsieur Morel, who a little later succeeded Belizani as head of the Merchant Marine, of which he was the director under Monsieur de Seygnalay. At present, Monsieur de Lagni is in charge of the Merchant Marine.

Finally, the King, at the suggestion of Seygnalay, decided to give La Salle two of his frigates: one of thirty-six cannons to carry him on his expedition; the other, a small frigate of fifty to sixty tons, to remain with him in this country.¹⁴

They gave La Salle a commission independent of the Governor of Canada; two companies of fifty soldiers, each with blank commissions in which La Salle could write the names of the officers; an engineer; a fund from which he could pay his people a year's salary in advance; an order on the Treasurer of Marine in Rochefort (from which port he sailed) for everything that would be necessary for the expedition, together with twelve cannons, and as much ammunition and arms as he wished.

¹⁴ The frigate of thirty-six cannons is the one in which, as is clear from this report, Monsieur Beaugau [Beaujeu] returned to France. It will be told later how the smaller ship was lost.

Monsieur Beaugeu [Beaujeu], Captain of one of the King's ships, was placed in command. He embarked from Rochelle in July, 1684, with four ships: namely, the two mentioned above; another of two hundred and fifty tons that was loaded in Rochelle to carry the equipment; and a ketch of forty tons (which was captured by the Spaniards off the coast of Santo Domingo).¹⁵ They remained in Santo Domingo two months to take on fresh provisions. On November 20, 1684, they set sail to seek the mouth of the Mississippi. They sailed along the coast of Florida until they thought that they were in the latitude and longitude which they were seeking; namely, latitude 27° 30' northeast;¹⁶ longitude, 292° between the Magdalena River and the Bay of Espíritu Santo. About eighty leagues from the east is Panuas, a town of the Spaniards.¹⁷

At the place at which he disembarked, Monsieur Beaugeu [Beaujeu] remained two months with his frigate. The place is a kind of sandbank which extends the length of Florida as far as Carolina. On leaving this place neither La Salle nor Beaugeu [Beaujeu] knew how far from the mainland this sandbank was, nor did they know how wide was the water between the coast and this reef. Beaugeu [Beaujeu], who had gone with the engineer in a shallop in an attempt to make the mainland, was forced to return after going about fifteen leagues from south to north. He found only some small islands in this lagoon. He made soundings throughout the whole trip. The deepest water was nine feet, and the shallowest was five feet.

The sandbank is fifteen, twenty-four, and thirty-six paces wide, more or less, and at distances of fifteen, twenty, and twenty-five leagues is cut by channels through which the rivers which empty into this lagoon flow into the sea. On this delta there is no fresh water, but in places there are coves in which rainwater is collected. Being half salty, it caused sickness among almost all the people. Some had hemorrhages, others suffered from scurvy. Of the one hundred and fifty persons (soldiers, officers, and others) whom Beaugeu [Beaujeu] left with La

¹⁵ The Spaniards admit that they captured the ketch off the coast of Santo Domingo. These pilots and the captain say that they have sailed with some of the men who captured it. A report on its capture was sent to Spain.

¹⁶ There seems to be a mistake about the latitude. In latitude 27° there is, as the diary shows, neither river nor bay.

¹⁷ They are mistaken about Panuas. The place is Pánuco and is twelve leagues up the river from Tampico.

Salle, not more than ten were in good health. When he sailed from there, five or six were dying on La Salle every day.¹⁸

Upon their arrival in this territory the Frenchmen found a nation of some four hundred or five hundred Indians who were clothed in the skins of a kind of wild ox which the Spaniards call *cibola* [buffalo].

La Salle had brought with him from France an Indian from the Mississippi who did not understand the language of these natives. They had never seen Europeans, and knew nothing of tobacco. At first the French got along well with the Indians; later they become involved in difficulties through events of little importance. This fact cost the life of three Frenchmen who were killed with arrows, and two more were wounded. Finally, Beaugau [Beaujeu] left La Salle in very bad shape on that sandbank. La Salle did not know what would become of him. In his small boat he had no fresh water, for he had lost the frigate, when, against the wishes of his pilots, he attempted to enter the lagoon.

On this voyage to discover the mouth of the Mississippi, La Salle had, all told, the shallop from the lost frigate, the canoe or shallop from the small frigate, two canoes which he had received from the Indians, and three other canoes which his men had

¹⁸ The present witnesses say that according to this report La Salle was looking for the mouth of the Mississippi in latitude 27°. There is in this latitude, as they have said, neither river or bay. They went on to discuss the rest of the report. The area of dikes and sandbanks which they describe is that which extends from the Río del Maupate to the Río Mexicano, as is seen in detail in the diary. They regard as certain that this region which they describe is the coast on which Beaugau [Beaujeu] left La Salle. Moreover, all the indications are the same as those which these witnesses saw. This fact is proved by the notation in the diary, March 30, of the wreckage which they found of the two-hundred-fifty-ton frigate. In the diary one will see this more in detail because these witnesses, judging from gears that they found in the canoes that the ship was even of three hundred tons. From the diary one will learn that the gear and a hatchet were from France. Although this is convincing proof, more convincing is the proof given in the diary, under date of April 4, of the loss of the fifty to sixty ton frigate in which, doubtlessly, La Salle lost his life. It was completely aground, about a musket's-shot distance from shore. On its stern was a shield with the fleur-de-lis. Its size corresponds, with slight difference, to the twenty-four or twenty-six cubits which the diary records. From the condition of the ship and its gear and tackle, these witnesses reckoned that the ship had been wrecked more than a year ago. Their reckoning fits the date on which the ship was lost, for La Salle left Santo Domingo at the end of 1684. Computed from this date, together with the time that he must have spent in sailing, the period will be over a year. For the remainder of their observation they refer to the diary, in which they say that they were unable to find out from the Indians how and when the Frenchmen perished.

taken forcibly from the Indians because they had set some snares on the shore near the wreck of the frigate.

This, Sir, is a compendium of the report which Beaugau [Beaujeu] has made to Monsieur de Seygnalay of his voyage and of the state in which he left La Salle.

To obtain it, I have had more trouble than you can imagine, for as yet they want to keep the matter a deep secret. Not long ago Seygnalay sent a ship of seven hundred tons to Santo Domingo, loaded with one hundred thirty women, who are to marry the buccaneers, with whom the French are on very friendly terms. Beaugau [Beaujeu] suggested that on this ship help be sent to La Salle, but they would not listen to him. The reason for this is that money is lacking, and they assure me that this undertaking has already cost the King more than the discovery of America cost Ferdinand and Isabella. For the present, they will not even think of doing anything, unless La Salle personally can arouse interest in the enterprise.

I shall try always to be on the lookout, and should the French attempt even the least thing, I shall advise Your Majesty. They have promised to send me the map of this discovery, and I would have sent it to you if the men here were men of their word.

Walter J. O'Donnell,
Translator

The Judiciary Act of 1789—A Stepping Stone in National Development

(EDITOR'S NOTE. In the previous installment of this article some consideration was given to the position, as well as to the importance, of the judiciary in a Federal system of government, such as that of the United States. The outstanding provisions of the Judiciary Act of 1789 were outlined and the attitude of the framers who devised the act in the first Congress, together with the views of the leading members of Congress at the time it was in the process of drafting. This was followed by a summary of the viewpoints of members of the Constitutional Convention to show that the Judiciary Act of 1789 was substantially within the contemplation of the Fathers of the Republic, as was the idea that the Supreme Court should occupy an independent position with the power to review legislation and pass on its constitutionality. Some further treatment is here given to the views of the framers of the Constitution and the leaders in the state constitutional conventions.)

IV

To confirm further the view that the majority of the members of the Constitutional Convention favored lodging with the court the power of reviewing statutes and passing upon their constitutionality, the resolutions proposed by Paterson, as a spokesman of the smaller states, are conclusive evidence of this fact.

Resolution six was proposed by the smaller states and contemplated giving the Confederation the power to call out troops against any state that should oppose or prevent the carrying into execution of the acts and treaties of the federal government.⁵¹ This, of course, was not incorporated in the final draft of Article Six of the Constitution.⁵² Rather than permit such a strong military power to be exercised by the United States, it was the

⁵¹ Farrand, *Records of the Federal Convention*, Vol. I, pp. 244, 245. In *The Doctrine of Judicial Review*, Corwin, the author, asserts that emphasis is laid upon Article VI, Paragraph 2 of the Constitution which announces the supremacy of the Constitution and the fact that the state judges are to take an oath to enforce this supreme law, anything in the law or Constitution of any state to the contrary notwithstanding. Why did the framers incorporate this provision in the Constitution unless it was their aim to assert the superiority of the Constitution itself to acts of Congress, as well as to the acts of state legislatures? The mandate in this article is addressed particularly to state judges. It is Corwin's idea that Article VI is even more important than the provision in Article III that the judicial power of the United States extend to all cases arising out of the Constitution (p. 14). In short, the conclusion is that judicial review was vested by the framers of the Constitution upon the certain general principle which in their opinion made specific provision for it unnecessary.

⁵² Article VI, Constitution of the United States.

consensus of the leaders of the Convention that this power should be given to the courts.

Some of the pro-constitutionalists had often in the course of the debates in the Convention expressed the belief that the state courts could be entrusted with the power of preserving the rights of the respective governments, subject to appeal to the federal Supreme Court. John Rutledge of South Carolina in the federal Convention of 1787 said: "The state tribunals might and ought to be left in all cases to decide, in the first instance, the right of appeal to the supreme national tribunal, being sufficient to secure the national rights and uniformity of judgments." Roger Sherman of Connecticut supported this view and wrote some time later: "The Constitution does not make it necessary that any inferior tribunals should be instituted, but it may be done if found necessary; it's probable that the courts of particular states will be authorized by the laws of the Union as has been heretofore done in cases of piracy." Oliver Ellsworth himself had written with reference to the state courts: "Nothing hinders . . . that all the cases, except the few in which it (the Supreme Court) has original and not appellate jurisdiction, may in the first instance be had in said courts."⁵³

All of this carries the implication that although the state courts might be given considerable jurisdiction in federal matters, in the last analysis the power of review would necessarily be placed in the courts of final resort in the federal government.

Warren in *The Making of the Constitution* states that it is also possible that this idea of giving the judiciary power to review state legislation may have been fostered by the publication, just as the Convention met, of a pamphlet entitled *Fragments on the Confederation of the American States*, in which it was proposed that "in order to prevent an oppressive exercise of the powers deposited with Congress, the jurisdiction should be established to intervene and determine between the individual states and the federal body upon all disputed points, and being styled the Equalizing Court, should be constituted and conducted in the following manner."⁵⁴ This scheme provided for the division of the states into three equal sections and for the nomination by the legislature of each state of one candidate "schooled in

⁵³ Charles A. Beard in *The Supreme Court and the Constitution* gives documentary evidence to indicate that the majority of the leading members of the Constitutional Convention were in favor of the judicial interpretation of the Constitution.

⁵⁴ See *Pennsylvania Gazette*, June 6, 1787.

economics and jurisprudence," Congress to draw by lot one judge for each section. It was proposed that this court hear and determine all appeals made by Congress against the state or by the state against Congress, which determination should be final and binding upon the parties.⁵⁵

It is apparent, therefore, from an examination of both the Randolph and the Paterson plans that there was no radical difference in the views entertained by the proponents of the respective plans with respect to the power of the court to review final acts of Congress and the legislation of the states. In other words, the two proposals taken together prove conclusively that the Judiciary Act of 1789 was in close approximation of the views of the framers of the Constitution.

V

In less than four months after the Convention had completed its work, the states of Delaware, and New Jersey along with Georgia had practically given their unqualified approval of the Constitution. This was later followed by the action of New Hampshire, Maryland, and South Carolina. Most of the difficulty in securing the ratification of the instrument came from the larger states. Superior ability, better organization, and familiarity with the instrument enabled the constitutionalists after a very bitter contest to overcome the obstacles set up by the anti-constitutionalists of Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia. The subject of the power of the courts played no small part in the deliberations of the members of the Constitutional Convention. Pennsylvania was one of the first of the larger states to approve the Constitution. It is apparent now that had it not been for the fact that the Convention convened in Philadelphia where the sentiment was strongly federalist, much difficulty would have been encountered in securing its ratification. The defeated members protested the manner in which the proceedings of the Convention had been conducted, and, particularly, the speed with which the Constitution was ratified. Their protests, however, were in vain.⁵⁶ Beveridge, in his very scholarly *Life of John Marshall* (Vol. I, p. 331), says concerning the methods employed in the Pennsylvania Constitutional Convention:

⁵⁵ It is curious to note that the Secretary of Agriculture, Henry A. Wallace, suggested recently at a meeting of the Academy of Political Science in New York the establishment of an economic council to consider questions of economic interest to the nation.

⁵⁶ McMaster and Stone, p. 453.

The language, manners, and methods of the supporters of the Constitution in the Pennsylvania Convention were resented outside the hall. "If anything could induce me to oppose the new Constitution," wrote a citizen signing himself "Federalist," "it would be the indecent, supercilious carriage of its advocates towards its opponents."

and going further, Beveridge relates:

That although outnumbered two to one, cuffed and buffeted without mercy in debate, scoffed at and jeered at by the people of the Quaker City, the minority was stiffnecked and defiant. Their heads were "bloody but unbowed." Three days after the vote for ratification, 46 "ayes" to 23 "nays" had been taken, the minority issued an address to their constituents. It relates the causes that led to the Federal Convention, describes its members, sets forth its usurpation of power, details the efforts to get popular support for the Constitution "whilst the glided chains were forging in the secret conclave."

In spite of the fact that the proceedings of the Convention in Philadelphia were somewhat hurried, there was some discussion relative to the power of the courts. Mr. Wilson was without a doubt the leading member of the Pennsylvania Convention and took upon himself the burden of explaining and defining its various provisions. In answer to certain objections that were being very strenuously urged against the Constitution, he said:

If a law should be made inconsistent with these powers vested by this instrument in Congress, the judges, as a consequence of their independence, and the particular powers of government being defined, will declare such law to be null and void, for the power of the Constitution predominates. Anything, therefore, which shall be enacted by Congress contrary thereto will not have the force of law.⁵⁷

Of all the state constitutional conventions, the most capable, from the viewpoint of members present and participating in the discussions and deliberations, was the Virginia State Convention. It was exceptional for the reason that not all of the members of ability were on the side of the constitutionalists, but there were some very able opponents of the Constitution. The entire subject matter of the Constitution was treated in detail. Other states watched with close interest the results of this Virginia Convention and the pro-constitutionalists were fearful of its outcome.⁵⁸ At the very outset, the opponents of the Constitution committed a strategic blunder by proposing that the Constitution be "discussed clause by clause through all its parts" before any

⁵⁷ Jonathan Elliott, *The Debates of the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution*, Washington, 1836, Vol. II, pp. 452 et passim.

⁵⁸ Beveridge, *Life of John Marshall*, Vol. I, p. 358.

question should be put on the instrument itself or any part of it.⁵⁹ The delegates proceeded to discuss the Constitution from the preamble down through the various articles in almost infinite detail.⁶⁰ Grayson, one of the members of the Convention, discussed objections to the federal courts and pointed out the difficulties that would arise by states passing repugnant and contradictory statutes, giving unqualified approval to the scheme provided for by the Constitution, and anticipating the twenty-fifth section of the Judiciary Act enacted later by Congress. Patrick Henry displayed remarkable ability in handling every topic and discussed with great perspicacity the provisions in the Constitution on the subject of the courts.⁶¹ He viewed with alarm the extensive power exercised by the Supreme Court. He said:

These judges must be acquainted with the laws of the different states. I see arising out of that paper, a tribunal, that is to be resorted to in all cases, when the destruction of the state judiciaries shall happen and from the extensive jurisdiction of these paramount courts, the state courts must soon be annihilated.⁶²

Madison stated that no fears should be entertained about annihilating state courts. Speaking of the cases that would come within the jurisdiction of the Constitution, he said: "Ninety-nine out of a hundred, will remain with the state judiciaries."⁶³

In the North Carolina convention, Spencer delivered a long harangue objection to the judiciary.⁶⁴ Mr. Spaight, who had been a member of the Federal Convention and had been elected as a delegate to the State Convention, pointed out that the members of the Federal Convention had been practically unanimous in keeping separate the federal and state governments, but in order to preserve the proper equilibrium between the two and to provide for a proper observance on the part of each government to keep within its own sphere of activities, he argued most eloquently for the necessity of a supreme tribunal. He said: "Whenever any government is established, it ought to have power to enforce its laws or else it might as well have no power"; and going further, he stated: "No government can exist without a judiciary to enforce its laws."⁶⁵ Discussion was also carried on in pamphlets, newspapers, and documents of various

⁵⁹ Elliott, *Debates*, Vol. III, p. 4.

⁶⁰ Beveridge, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 367-480.

⁶¹ Elliott, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 54; also pp. 492-99.

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 493, 494.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 489.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, pp. 148-49.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

kinds, all of which are eloquently indicative of the attitude of the persons responsible for framing the Constitution and preparing the organization of the government.

At the time of the ratification of the Constitution by the state conventions there was considerable talk about having the state courts act in place of inferior federal courts. Francis Dana thought that "the supreme judicial courts of the several states ought to be the federal district courts." "I think it would be wise to institute the state courts where they are well established, as the inferior courts," wrote Edward Carrington to James Monroe, "for should the United States erect separate courts, the probability is that bickerings will arise between the two jurisdictions; this, as you say, is in the discretion of Congress; and I trust that that discretion will be exercised properly."⁶⁶ Oliver Ellsworth, who changed his attitude on this subject and who later had so much to do with the actual drafting of the measure, anticipated the action of Congress when he said: "To annex to state courts jurisdiction which they had not before, as of admiralty cases and perhaps, of offenses against the United States, would be constituting the judges of them, pro tanto, federal judges, and of course they would continue as such during good behavior, and on fixed salaries which, in many cases would illy comport with their present tenure of office. Besides, if the state courts, as such, could take cognizance of those offenses it might not be safe for the general government to put the trial and punishment of them entirely out of its own hands."⁶⁷

The proof is cumulative that the leading members of the national and state conventions favored granting to the court the power to pass upon the constitutionality of national laws as well as of the enactments of state legislatures. Their actions and speeches constitute merely a preface to and a forerunner of the outstanding provisions of the Judiciary Act of 1789.

The twenty-fifth section of the Judiciary Act may be assigned the chief part of the influence which the federal courts have had upon the law and development of the United States. An enumeration of some of the important decisions construing the Judiciary Act of 1789 brings out with striking emphasis the exercise of the power of issuing writs of error from the Supreme Court of the

⁶⁶ Carrington to Monroe, September 15, 1788, *Documentary History of the Constitution*, p. 54.

⁶⁷ Ellsworth to Law, August 4, 1789, *Wharton's State Trials*, p. 38. See also Smith of South Carolina; Madison, *First Congress, First Session*, pp. 801, 802.

United States to the supreme courts of the various states. It is important to bear in mind that the statute with reference to the exercise of this power provided also for the extensive powers to be exercised by the federal courts, and it seems that those who drafted the Judiciary Act intended to give the Supreme Court just those powers that the framers of the Constitution desired it should possess. Since men of opposite views had a share in drafting this organic measure, the Act, like the Constitution, may be termed an instrument of compromises, still, long and eloquent objections would have issued from the states' rights group if there was a conviction that the twenty-fifth section was not in conformity with the views of those who were most responsible for the formation of the government.

The history of the United States indicates that opinion on the subject of the jurisdiction of the courts has varied according to economic and social stresses of particular times. Georgia from the very beginning was a source of trouble for the Supreme Court and was responsible for several cases which caused nation-wide apprehension for the continued existence of the Union. In fact, the case of *Chisholm v. Georgia* in 1793 resulted in the ratification of the Eleventh Amendment to the Constitution which prohibited the right to bring an action against a state by citizens of another state or of any foreign state. Between the years 1789 and 1860, the courts of seven states denied the constitutional right of the United States Supreme Court to decide cases on writ of error from the state courts. They were Virginia, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Ohio, Georgia, Kentucky, California, and South Carolina. In fact, the legislatures of some of these states adopted resolutions or statutes against the power of the Supreme Court, attacking particularly the twenty-fifth section of the Constitution. Repeated appeals were made in Congress from time to time to deprive the Court of this jurisdiction, and resolutions were proposed to this effect intermittently from 1821 to 1882.

Due to the power of the Supreme Court of the United States to pass upon the validity of state statutes, under the Judiciary Act, the court has, to a great extent, controlled the economic and social development of this country. A brief reference need only be made to the more important decisions affecting the economic, political, and social development of the United States. Among some of the monumental constitutional decisions we find the *Dartmouth College* case which passed on the security of charters issued to corporations by states; *McCulloch v. Maryland*,

which discussed the right of the state to tax national agencies; *Gibbons v. Ogden*, in which was involved the very important question of regulating interstate commerce; *Brown v. Maryland*, dealing with the subject of foreign commerce; *Craig v. Missouri* and the other *Legal Tender Cases*, dealing with the question of states issuing bills of credit and other matters of financial consequence to the history of the United States; *The Slaughterhouse Cases*, treating of the scope of the Fourteenth Amendment; the recent social legislation such as the *Child Labor Law* which on two occasions has been held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court; and the trend shown by the Court with reference to the present "New Deal" legislation.

The attacks that have previously been made on the Supreme Court are of interest to us now in view of the fulminations of certain members of Congress against the present court. There is, however, this difference. The attack on the twenty-fifth section was led by the states' rights party; the Court, however, by its monumental decisions, advanced principles to favor a strong national government. The recent cases decided by the Supreme Court have resulted in declaring Congressional enactments unconstitutional on the theory that they were matters for state concern. Since the first two decades of the present century, the Court has shown a tendency to protect the vanishing rights of the state. Now it appears in the role of the guardian and defender of the rights of the states against the encroachments of the national government.

JOHN A. ZVETINA

Loyola University
Chicago, Illinois

Notes and Comment

The current number of MID-AMERICA is dedicated in an informal way and according to its content to the State of Texas, which is celebrating this year the centennial of independence. Many projects for commemorating the event are under way, but none are more inspiring to the historians of Catholicity than those of our esteemed colleagues in the Texas Catholic Historical Society and in the Texas Knights of Columbus Historical Commission. The chairman of the Commission, Paul J. Folk, C. S. C., Ph. D., announces a series of volumes under the running title of "Our Catholic Heritage in Texas," "a critical and comprehensive history, the scope of which embraces both civil and ecclesiastical development from the earliest times, taken principally from original source materials in Europe and America, many of which are now in a process of exploration for the first time." Two volumes are now in press, Volume I, *The Finding of Texas*, and Volume II, *The Winning of Texas*. These pertain to the mission era and have been prepared by Dr. Carlos E. Castañeda, historiographer of the mission era in Texas, whose scholarship leaves no doubt as to the comprehensiveness of the background for the elaborate volumes to follow. Readers may look forward with great anticipation for these productions.

For a week prior to April 21 there will be music, parades, and pageantry at Houston, Texas. The beautifully engraved invitations to the celebration of the liberation of the Lone Star State come from Church and State and are worded as follows: "The State of Texas joins Most Reverend Christopher E. Byrne, D. D., Bishop of Galveston, in requesting the honor of your presence at a Solemn Military Field Mass to be celebrated by Most Reverend Joseph F. Rummel, D. D., Bishop of New Orleans on San Jacinto Battlefield at ten-thirty o'clock on the morning of April twenty-first, nineteen hundred and thirty-six in thanksgiving for A Century of Civil and Religious Freedom. Sermon by Most Reverend John J. Cantwell, D. D., Bishop of Los Angeles"; "The State of Texas requests the honor of your presence on San Jacinto Battlefield near Houston on the twenty-first day of April, nineteen hundred and thirty-six, The One Hundredth Anniversary of the Battle of San Jacinto where the embattled pioneers of Texas secured for us with their valor the blessings of civil and religious liberty."

The translated documents in preceding pages pertaining to the La Salle occupation of Texas are part of the activity of Catholic scholars of Texas, and so too are the findings of Mr. David Donoghue on Quivira. The La Salle documents will appear soon as a separate brochure and as a number of the Preliminary Studies of the Texas Catholic Historical Society, with an introduction by Dr. Castañeda. The latter has recently issued *The First American Play* as Number 1, Volume III of the Preliminary Studies, a reprint from *The Catholic World* of January, 1932.

The *University of Toronto Quarterly* for October, 1935, published an all too short article of unusually readable merit on "The Noble Army of Martyrs in Huronia," by Philip Child. It is the story of the Jesuit martyrdoms written with a glowing and appreciative pen; in a wider significance

tion it is a brief for the spread of Christianity in any wilderness, and the eulogy might well be applied not only to the brave men who "have enriched the air we breathe in Canada," but to the many others who marched to martyrdom before and after them in the Americas in order that the European Christian heritage might be transplanted.

The *Michigan History Magazine*, Winter Number, 1936, devotes many of its pages to recording many of the items pertaining to the centennial celebrations held throughout the state in honor of the first hundred years of statehood. George N. Fuller, the editor, describes "Detroit, Michigan's Capital 100 Years Ago," in the opening article.

The *Canadian Historical Review* for December, 1935, tells the homely but fundamental story of "The First Introduction of European Plants and Animals into Canada," over the name of R. M. Saunders. Due credit is given to the missionaries for bringing these "basic elements of the older society of Europe," that went into the making of Canada. Elsewhere there is an account of the "National Archives of the United States," the vast project of our Government for organizing with the aid of micro-photography millions of historical documents. At the recent American Historical Association meeting in Chattanooga, Tennessee, Dr. Vernon Tate, chief of the division of duplication and of photographic reproduction, described the elaborate plan of obtaining and preserving documents by means of the camera eye.

A pamphlet entitled *Suggested Readings in Illinois History* compiled by Paul M. Angle has recently been published by the Illinois State Historical Society, Springfield, Illinois. Toward the end of the long list of readings on general and particular phases of the history of Illinois, there is another array of historical fiction. Copies of this useful compilation may be secured free of charge. Unfortunately there is no mention made in the lists of useful articles which have appeared in *MID-AMERICA*; moreover, religion is neglected except for the Mormons at Nauvoo and the work on the Jesuit missions by Sister Mary Borgias Palm.

The *Catholic Historical Review* for January, 1936, gives place in its Miscellany to an account of a pioneer priest in the Middle West, Father Hercule Brassac, and publishes another of the many letters written by Father Brassac from Bardstown, Kentucky. This is an interesting continuation by Peter R. Resch of a labor begun by the late Archbishop Messmer of Milwaukee. Pertinent and very timely are the remarks in Notes and Comments on the Catholic Church and the Negro; several pages of bibliography pertaining to this subject follow the comments. Incidentally it might be remarked here that Reverend Arnold J. Garvy, S. J., professor emeritus at Loyola University, Chicago, has an elaborate bibliography on this same subject, which it is hoped he will one day publish.

The *Washington Historical Quarterly* has changed its title, and beginning with the January, 1936, issue will be known as *The Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, published at the University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. The *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* for October, 1935, has

an account of "Bank Failures in Chicago Before 1925," by R. G. Thomas. *The Louisiana Historical Quarterly* was issued in October, 1935, as the Shreveport Centennial Number, and the opening article is a history of the establishment and progress of the settlement under Henry Miller Shreve. This article of 100 pages by J. Fair Hardin is followed by another on the Caddo Indians by William B. Glover of 75 pages. The *Historical Bulletin* for March, 1936, contains "Unity, Continuity, Chance in History," by Gilbert J. Garraghan, a discussion of three concepts of history that is highly stimulating; among its other noteworthy contributions are articles on Church and State relations in the Middle Ages, in the United States, and in Germany under Bismarck.

The recently established *Journal of Southern History* published in its November, 1935, number "The Work of Southern Women Among the Sick and Wounded of the Confederate Armies," by Professors Francis B. Simpkins and James W. Patten. This will be a chapter in a forthcoming book, *The Women of the Confederacy*, by the same two authors. When the writers speak of the hospital work of the Catholic nuns, we are happy to read the following: "Doubtless the most skillful and devoted of all the women who nursed disabled Confederates were the members of the various Roman Catholic sisterhoods. They constituted the only class of women in the South possessed of formal training in nursing and hospital management, and they worked among the sick and wounded in camp, in hospital and on the battlefield with the calculated self-abnegation and efficiency that was traditional among such orders of holy women." Thus begins the description of the work of the sisters.

From various sources we note: that John Tate Lanning of Duke University is preparing a book on the culture of Colonial Hispanic America; that Robert Dudley Edwards has published *Church and State in Tudor Ireland: a History of Penal Laws against Irish Catholics, 1534-1603*; there is to be erected a \$500,000 building to house the Illinois state archives; that the present Mexican government through its Ministry of Foreign Relations continues its nativistic propaganda and defense of the socialist régime in the recent translation of Alfonso Zabre, *Guide to the History of Mexico, a Modern Interpretation*.

Franciscan Studies, No. 16, January, 1936, is a translation and edition of *Pioneer Capuchin Letters*, by Theodore Roemer, O. M. Cap., Ph. D. There is a preface and an introduction to the thirty-two letters which cover 134 pages. The letters are principally those of Father Francis Haas and Father Bonaventure Frey, and they cover the years between 1857 and 1883. They pertain to the founding of the Calvary Province of Saint Joseph of the Capuchin Order, whose starting point was Mount Calvary, Wisconsin. The foundation was unusual in that it was undertaken by two diocesan priests from Switzerland who entered the Order on their arrival in Wisconsin, but who had to shift for themselves shortly afterwards when their master of novices, Father Gachet, went to his labors among the Menominees. The letters telling the story of the work of the two newcomers were written to the two famous German mission aid societies, the Leopoldinen-Stiftung of Vienna and the Ludwig-Missionsverein of Munich, by way of appeals for

aid. The letters are well worth the reading for their human appeal, and at the same time are fine additions to the ever-increasing pages of documentary sources for Midwestern history.

The Iowa Catholic Historical Review of February, 1936, has noteworthy offerings. Reverend M. M. Hoffman writes on "Clement Smyth, Second Bishop of Iowa," and later presents a number of letters and documents; Theodosius Plassmeyer, O. F. M., has "The Church in Early Iowa City, a New Light on the First Franciscan Father in Iowa and on Bishop Clement Smyth, 1864-1865"; Anne M. Stuart continues her alphabetical catalogue of "Catholic Writers in Iowa"; Reverend W. G. Kessler presents the Secretary's Notes, which are followed by an abridged table of contents of the eight preceding volumes of the *Review*.

The Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society for January, 1936, devotes its first twenty pages to an account and an appreciation of Dr. Otto Leopold Schmidt, who at the time of his death last year was president of the Society. Dr. Theodore C. Pease presents an account of the life and work of the Chicago physician whose diversified interests made life easier and more pleasant for many Chicagoans. Dr. Schmidt began his medical practice in the Alexian Brothers Hospital in 1887, after his return from studies abroad. He was instructor in various local medical schools, introduced the first X-ray machine to Chicago, became the family physician in many prominent homes, gave his time, service, and money unsparingly to those in need. He became a member of the Chicago Board of Education, but neither his disinterestedness, nor his ability, nor his kindness, could influence for the better the political fanaticism aroused over the question of King George in the public school textbooks, and hence he resigned. He received numerous honorary awards, American and foreign, one of which was from Loyola University in 1930. Dr. Lawrence M. Larson, professor of history with Dr. Pease at the University of Illinois, contributes an appreciation, and, just as does his confrere, points to the historical interests of Dr. Schmidt. The gifts of collections, especially to the Chicago Historical Society, will always remain cherished possessions and tributes to the friendly Dr. Schmidt.

Contributors

J. Manuel Espinosa, Ph. D., is assistant professor of history in St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.

Mr. David Donoghue of Fort Worth, Texas, engineer and geologist, gives his solution to a problem that has troubled historians for upwards of fifty years.

Reverend Walter J. O'Donnell, C. S. C., Ph. D., is at present in New Orleans, and until recently was professor of Spanish in St. Edward's University, Austin, Texas.

Mr. John A. Zvetina, M. A., J. D., is a member of the faculty of the Arts College of Loyola University, Chicago.

Book Reviews

John L. Stoddard, Traveller, Lecturer, Litterateur. By D. Crane Taylor.
P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York, 1935. pp. ix+325. \$3.00.

John Lawson Stoddard was born in Boston in 1850, and died in 1931 at Meran in the Austrian Tyrol. He rose to fame and wide popularity as a lecturer; he secured and broadened his fame by his voluminous writings; he retired at the age of fifty-one, married and began a new life of idyllic seclusion. The World War drove him from his delightful retreat on Lake Como to scenes of suffering near the Austrian front. It swept away most of his wealth, but made him a father to the needy and distressed, and aided providentially in "rebuilding a lost faith."

Stoddard's long life possessed a completeness, an inner coherence and a meaning. The writing of it was a relatively easy task. No great ingenuity was required. There was nothing to tax the biographer's historical technique. Material was abundant and ready to hand. A problem of selection and of proper emphasis, of course, there was; but it would be difficult for a writer of balanced judgment to go far wrong, and there was slight temptation to produce a caricature of the modernesque type. It is refreshing to follow a writer who lets a good story tell itself without intruding into it the diseased and distorted subjectivism which is the menace of modern biography.

Mr. Taylor happened upon his subject, he tells us, by accident. He undertook the work with enthusiasm as a labor of love. From intimate conversation with his hero during the closing year of his life he drew inspiration, understanding, and much factual knowledge. Stoddard's published lectures, his other literary efforts and especially his great *apologia* provided an orderly and easily controllable mass of materials in which Stoddard the man stands revealed. Letters from admirers over half-a-century and newspaper clippings assembled by his managers, in which the reactions of the public to his triumphs on the lecture platform are mirrored, served as a commentary. There was little need for sifting. The lectures were masterly in style and content, and the praise and appreciation were unanimous. The trials that might have darkened the declining years of Stoddard, but which in fact brought the dawn of his conversion to the Catholic Church, called for a more skillful and delicate hand. And in this Mr. Taylor, a non-Catholic, does his work surprisingly well. In view of this we incline to pass over in silence a few questionable statements in the second chapter, anent the "irrefutable logic" of Huxley, who was "so forceful and relentlessly logical that a man of intelligence must be convinced (!)"

One may question the appropriateness of this biography for review in MID-AMERICA. True, Stoddard lived and worked in distant parts, but Chicago, at least, furnished some of his most devoted audiences, while other cities in the Middle West clamored for him. His writings, when not his spoken word, made all America travel-conscious, battering down the barriers of provincialism. But if his professional activities and influence ignored geographical limits, the drama of his religious loss and recovery belongs to all humanity. From Calvinism through forty-five years of agnosticism to the Catholic Church was not the whole story. At the "eleventh

hour" he came into the Vineyard, but God gave him fourteen productive years, and at the age of eighty he was still at work. Merited honors came to him, especially from the Holy See. His influence for good continues, through the books he wrote, to combat the forces of irreligion. Stoddard's new-found Faith opened new vistas to him, but we can look back upon what he called his "wasted years" and see the working of a consistently fine character and a fidelity to truth as he saw it, which deserved the success that came to him in the natural order and prepared his soul for the hour of grace.

R. CORRIGAN

St. Louis University

The Historical Scholarship of Saint Bellarmine. By E. A. Ryan, S. J., Docteur en Sciences Historiques. Fordham University Press, New York, 1936. pp. xiv+226.

"In this study the sources and extent of the erudition of Saint Robert Cardinal Bellarmine are examined in detail. Indications of historical methodology are also noted." After chapters devoted to Bellarmine's studies in Italy and Louvain, the more important writings of the learned cardinal are subjected to scrutiny and evaluation. Attention is called to the fact that Luther's acceptance of Scripture as the sole rule of faith limited the role of history in theology, for it ruled out the fathers, popes, and councils. In this scheme of things history was to serve only to refute Catholics. Thus Matthias Flacius Illyricus sought in history a justification for the new position in religion. Starting with the early Church he endeavored to trace the advance of papal power to mastery over the whole Church. Catholics in consequence were driven to meet their adversaries with the same weapons. To do so was no easy task because of the current attitude towards history. For example, in Italy, where Bellarmine was first educated, the classic historians were read "as Latin and Greek Texts." Cardinal Toledo regarded history as an art to regulate expression. Furthermore some were of the opinion that "history should not be taught to the young," since "it was a study to be pursued by those of mature years." Not a few schools excluded history from their curriculum. For Bellarmine, then, history was incidental during his early studies. Indeed it would seem that, despite occasional references to them, Bellarmine never read the histories of the Italian republics so popular in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Nevertheless he developed a healthy skepticism so necessary to the historian. And at Louvain his interest in chronology, patrology, and ecclesiastical history was aroused. Here too he composed the first drafts of his more important historical works.

By common consent *De Scripturis Ecclesiasticis* is awarded first place in Bellarmine's historical writings. It was a painstaking effort to appraise all the literature of the Catholic past, to separate the authentic from the spurious. On his own admission he labored at this task intermittently for forty years before its publication. It has some serious limitations, prominent among them the fact that he confined his observations to works he knew to be extant. In this as in his other writings Bellarmine was primarily a controversialist; he was conscious that he was engaged in theological warfare, and for that reason he sought dogmatic rather than

historical proofs. Consequently his writings combine the historical element with dogmatic conceptions to such a degree that it is difficult to estimate his historical ability.

In brief, Bellarmine conceived the function of the historian to be to describe the past with fidelity. The breadth of his erudition was remarkable even if the period of his activity in research was short. He was primarily a theologian with an outlook on ecclesiastical history characteristic of members of the Counter Reformation. In the matter of textual criticism he was not in advance of others of his day, in fact, he failed to realize the complexity of the problem, but he did recognize the superiority of external over internal criteria. He was inconsistent in that he rejected the false Decretals, but did not reject the pseudo-Dionysius, although he appears to have been aware of its real character. In his work *De excusatione Barclaii* he advances hypotheses for which he gives no solid historical argument or proof, and he is guilty of taking texts in their most literal meaning without really trying to discover the meaning of the author. Bellarmine's limitations as an historian are therefore many and serious, but "with clarity of comprehension and rare surety of judgment, and by dint of exceptional industry he succeeded in mastering and synthesizing the results of the historical advance made in the sixteenth century."

Dr. Ryan gives us an excellent study of Bellarmine the historian. With scholarly impartiality he notes the virtues and defects of his subject. His text is amply documented, and a comprehensive bibliography and good index enhance the volume. If it be not captious we would submit that in an English text "Bruxelles" should give place to "Brussels," and "Trier" to "Treves," and it strikes one as strange to have a Roman emperor referred to as "Constance." Quite a number of small errors have escaped the proof-readers, and the printing leaves something to be desired. These imperfections, however, in no wise detract from the excellence of the volume.

CHARLES H. METZGER

West Baden College

Revolution and Freemasonry, 1680-1800. By Bernard Fay. Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1935. pp. ix+349.

Bernard Fay is widely known in America for his ability as a lecturer on the society of the eighteenth century. His great popularity would appear to arise from his remarkable style and use of the English language, together with his brilliant mastery of story and humor. Few suspect that beneath his charming manner is concealed a broad knowledge of the social history of that revolutionary century. In developing his favorite theme of the international character of life in that epoch, as against the intense nationalism of the next block of history, he is altogether at home in treating the science, the nobility, the clubs and organizations, all of whose memberships and clienteles transcended the limits and borders of what we of this day are pleased to identify as the then nations of Europe and America.

Prosecuting his researches in this fine field, he constantly found himself caught in the problems arising from the wide diffusion of Freemasonry across the lines of his interests. His curiosity on this point was heightened by his close association with the scholar Cochin, whose writings on the Freemasonry of the French Revolution were unhappily broken off by his

untimely death in the great war. His special biographical study of Benjamin Franklin convinced him that he must go more deeply into the Masonic picture of which Franklin formed an imposing center. The result is the present book.

This volume will challenge many accepted points of view in the chief events of the eighteenth century, particularly the meteoric rise of Britain and the revolutions in the United States and in France. A historian must have proper sympathy for his subject if he would write fairly and worthily, and Fay goes far beyond any others in finding the social beneficence of Masonic purposes in the years after 1717 when the order was completely made over on modern lines. He shows how it caught up the spirit of the times: the despair in evangelical Protestantism coupled with the desire for order and service and good government, all mingled with much mysticism and flippancy and philosophical play. The inner character and aim of the builder, J. T. Desaguliers, the powerful Huguenot remaker of London Masonry, and the evolution of his efforts in forming the constitutions and charges of all continental lodges, is the best part of the book and entitles the author to the merit of discovery in this field. The treatment is organic and thorough and absolutely convincing. But many dissenting voices will arise to denounce the author for his emphasis on Masonry in our own Revolution. There is, however, a very strong chain of evidence here brought forward, with ample documentation, on the origin of the plan for union presented in the Albany Congress, the Boston Tea Party, the abandonment of colonial jealousies and acceptance of Washington as leader, the campaigns, the aid of France, the Declaration of Independence, the final victory, the positive force exerted toward French Revolution by this victory, and the emergence of the United States of America as the one republic of the world.

The book is delightful reading. It is a unity, not simply a succession of chapters of assembled and codified data. This man knows how to write, and his approaches to his problems could well form models for young (and older) historiographers. Of bibliography there is no superabundance, though a sufficient essay on that topic accompanies the separate chapters. The student is referred to all the best depositories of Masonic documents, and these have been ransacked by the author for the past seven or eight years as he went on developing his research. He supposes, of course, that his readers who wish more on his subject will go to the French who have published worthy studies of Freemasonry during the past two decades, particularly Cochin and Martin.

One particularly bad typographical blunder obscures an entire line on page 217 and seriously injures the trend of the narrative. What may seem a serious fault is the giving over of the first fifty-three pages to the lives of Anthony Hamilton and the Comte de Boulainvilliers, before any direct mention of the chief subject of the book. This judgment will promptly be reversed when one finds that he has unconsciously been given a thorough introduction to the inner spirit of Masonry and its point of departure, in the narrative of these obscure but vitally important careers.

W. EUGENE SHIELS

Loyola University, Chicago

French Catholic Missionaries in the Present United States, 1604-1791. By Sister Mary Doris Mulvey, O.P., M.A. The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. pp. ix+158.

The purpose of this doctoral dissertation is to bring together all those facts which tell the story of the French Catholic missionaries who labored between the years 1604 and 1791 within the limits of what are now the United States. There is promise of a "synthetic appreciation of the French missionaries in the United States history," and of a consecutive story "of the labors of the French missionaries," but it seems to the reviewer that there is a falling short in respect to such an accomplishment. It appears that too much prominence is given to La Hontan and Bossu for a thesis of this type, while Rochemonteix, whose work is still to be superseded, gets scanty recognition. Again, better use could have been made of Sister Mary Borgias Palm's findings, and Father Habig's work on the Recollects who accompanied La Salle might have been mentioned. There are a number of inaccuracies which a careful scrutiny may detect. Father Dumas is made to return to France in 1740, whereas he went back in 1730; neither the work of M. Huvé among the Indians, nor that of Davion was successful; there were Capuchins at Natchez after the revolt of the Indians; Father Maximin had left Natchitoches in 1730; the priest there from 1730 to 1734 was a Jesuit. There is no Capuchin or Jesuit view for the successive divisions of Louisiana into ecclesiastical jurisdictions, but what is called the "Jesuit version" is the minutes of the deliberations of the Company of the Indies in Paris, as well as the royal itemized accounts of expenses.

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War. By Colonel G. F. R. Henderson, C. B. Longmans, Green and Co., New York, 1936. pp. xxiv+737. \$5.00.

We have here the authorized American edition of a two-volume work which over a period of forty years has seen sixteen printings in England. It is the biography of a soldier, written by a soldier. It has been used in the British War College, and is still in use at West Point. This last fact is of importance for the reviewer who would not presume to pronounce on a military treatise, and for the lay reader whose doubts are thereby allayed as he follows the author day by day, hour by hour almost, through intricate movements on the battlefield. With this tacit approval of army men on both sides of the Atlantic we commend the book unreservedly. Freeman's masterful *R. E. Lee* may be a greater biography of a greater hero, but this need not blind us to the merits of *Stonewall Jackson* nor deter any prospective reader. Indeed, those who have learned to love and admire Robert E. Lee will want to know more about his most trusted lieutenant, who like Lee was great as a soldier, as a man, and as a Christian.

For most of us the best feature of the book will be the revelation of a deeply religious soul, of a man of rugged, honest character who "walked with God" in faith and purity and childlike piety, of a leader who prayed at the head of his troops and in the secrecy of his tent, who was unperurbed in adversity and self-possessed in his hour of victory because he attributed all to an overruling Providence. No one thinks of Lee as merely

a soldier. He was a Christian gentleman whose career happened to lie on the battlefield. The same is true of Jackson. His character was all of one piece, deep, strong, and always consistent. Jackson, the backwoods youth with a great ambition, is Jackson, the hard-working student at West Point, the young officer in Mexico, the professor at the head of his class, the Presbyterian deacon, the idol of the Army of the Valley. There is, of course, a surface distinction between the rigid disciplinarian, silent, hard, almost inhuman on the one hand, and the chivalrous, sympathetic, affectionate, tender-hearted friend of the poor and needy on the other; between the earnest devout soul that went through life with his gaze fixed on the vision of a higher world and the very human husband who found intense happiness in the simple joys of home. Punctual, precise, methodical, his duties were discharged with machine-like regularity. He was regarded as an ascetic who condemned the good things of life. He was called a fatalist and a fanatic. The simple fact is that he had found the secret of spiritual freedom and lived a fuller life than his critics knew or could imagine. His story is a spiritual tonic and an inspiration.

The major interest of the author lies in the consummate strategist who went into battle with a detailed plan that calculated every human element including even the state of mind of his adversary, in the master of tactics who never missed an opportunity and never failed to capitalize on the mistakes of the enemy, in the captain who never spared himself and who drove his men to heights of achievement. Much as one may dislike scenes of slaughter and little as he may understand the technical features of a military history, his attention is riveted on the single purpose of the leader. The half-finished drama of the war for Southern independence and the tragic death of the hero who felt that his was the rightful cause and that God would always uphold the right, lend an intense realism to the story.

The wide knowledge of the author displayed in numerous comparisons and contrasts keeps the mind alert. Wellington and Nelson, Napoleon, Ney, and Moltke are only a few of the great captains whose strategy and tactics are summoned to clarify and confirm the methods and movements of Jackson. Of these Napoleon was the greatest, and Jackson carried his *Marims* in his saddlebags. But the author is partial to Wellington whose Peninsular Campaign furnishes many an example to illustrate his meaning. If Jackson was to Lee what Marshall Ney was to Napoleon, the formula is shown to be inadequate at least in one respect. "Ney's valour was animal, Jackson's was moral." If posterity has regarded Jackson as a mere subordinate executing, but not devising the plans that led to victory, Colonel Henderson points out that this merely proves him to have been a perfect soldier, not that he was but the shadow of Lee. The Commander himself called Jackson his "right arm," and he trusted him as he was never again to trust a companion in arms, but he had a high regard for his independent judgment. Lee magnanimously attributed victories to Jackson (while Jackson maintained that he should have attributed them to God). What the reader of his reports to his chief could never guess became abundantly clear when his removal from the scene had dampened the ardor of Virginia's army and blasted the hope of Southern independence.

It should be noted that the book champions a double thesis. It is stated explicitly, though it may be read between the lines. Every nation should have a trained army and military men should control it. To put it in other

words, volunteer armies prolong a war and add to its carnage, while civilian meddling is the parent of disaster. The war between the states seems to prove the thesis. Does the World War disprove it? In any case, we have the army man's viewpoint, and the reader will not resent it. We note, also, that the author is an Englishman, and we smile indulgently at each recurrence of his naïve, but not altogether unfounded attempt to glorify Anglo-Saxon valor. Washington, Lee, and Jackson, like Wellington and Nelson, are in the author's philosophy the natural product of a superior race. But Colonel Henderson is not insular, and he is not uncritical in his appraisal of less flawless Englishmen of the Cromwell type.

The publisher deserves a word of commendation for the makeup of the book. Portraits, maps, and plans are a help toward clarity, while frequent indented dates, even to the hour of the day, enable the reader to follow each battle closely. The author has used the best sources with an air of finality. For a book written so long ago it is remarkably up-to-date.

R. CORRIGAN

St. Louis University

Old St. Peter's. By Leo Raymond Ryan, A. B., M. S. (E). The United States Catholic Historical Society, New York City, 1935. pp. xiii+282.

This volume was intended to fulfill a two-fold purpose. It was meant to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Old St. Peter's, "The Mother Church of Catholic New York, (1785-1935)." It was also advanced to satisfy in part the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in the department of history of Fordham University. The study is a credit to the institution which sponsored it, and the individual at whose suggestion the study was begun.

The first three chapters deal with New York under Dutch and English control, and as it was during the Revolutionary War period. A thorough discussion, based on sound documentary evidence, is presented of the relations between the ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church, and the Jesuit missionaries. Saint Isaac Jogues and his companions are dealt with briefly, but effectively. With the laying of the cornerstone of Old St. Peter's on October 5, 1785 (p. 46), the chronicle proper begins. The tortuous development of sound Catholicism in New York is then traced with scholarly exactness. Through several decades the besetting obstacle was lay trusteeism. Due largely to state legislation of 1784, which granted the right of church organizations to incorporate, the pastors of the church and the bishops on the one hand, and the lay trustees on the other, were to wage a long and bitter battle. Not until 1850 was the struggle ended, with Archbishop Hughes the victor (p. 202). Before the matter was settled the Catholics of New York had been humiliated by the open and legal sale of Old St. Peter's in 1844, for \$40,000.

In the meantime a second St. Peter's Church had replaced the first one, which had become unsuitable in 1836. The Grecian architecture which characterized the second church was not to be copied by the other churches in New York City. When one compares some of the architectural enigmas that have been built to house religious services, not only in New York City but throughout the nation, with the chaste simplicity of Old St.

Peter's, one is apt to wish that the children had tried more assiduously to copy the appearance of the parent.

Many interesting episodes associated with Catholic culture are developed as a century and a half of Catholic life are sketched. One such matter, related in Chapter V, was the reception into the Catholic Church in 1805 of Mrs. Elizabeth Ann Bayley Seton, foundress of the American branch of the Sisters of Charity. Another was the conversion of the Barber family, sketched in Chapter VI, which was unique in religious annals. Father and son became Jesuit priests; mother and four daughters became nuns. The great changes witnessed by the present church in the century it has been standing serenely in Barclay Street are presented with completeness and accuracy. The large number of annotated references give evidence of scholarly execution. Old St. Peter's is the richer as a result of the dissertation.

PAUL KINIERY

Loyola University, Chicago

The Spanish Missions of Georgia. By John Tate Lanning, with illustrations by Willis Physioc. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1935. pp. xiii+321. \$3.00.

Good reading comes from the Southland with this volume. It has been the contention of some historians for many years that the missions of southeastern North America, the territory known to the Spaniards as La Florida, were more numerous, more ancient, and more populous than those famed on the west coast as the California missions. The history of the early Spanish missions of the present state of Florida has been written by various writers. Georgia, which was once a portion of the vast territory, has recently been aroused to the value of its particular missionary heritage. The president of the University of Georgia acting as spokesman in a movement to unveil the early mission or Catholic advance requested Professor Lanning of Duke University to undertake the task of enlightening Georgians and others regarding the Catholic establishments. There is no questioning either the sympathy of this scholar of the South for his subject or the general knowledge which he shows of things ecclesiastical. A second edition of the work will undoubtedly correct the few mistakes in terminology that have crept into the text probably because of a laudable haste to give students and general readers important findings as quickly as possible. A second edition, however, can scarcely improve upon the format of the book and the art work of Willis Physioc.

There is progress and drama in the narrative. Georgia and its prehistoric races of savages are described. The Jesuits advanced into the inhospitable land and met a disastrous defeat. The Franciscans followed with the Spanish soldiery "to rehabilitate a shattered frontier." They organized the Franciscan reductions and carried the cross into the interior. After a successful evangelization in spite of Indian uprisings, the disintegration of the extensive mission chain began with the encroachment of the English, the raids of the infidel Indians, and Spanish apathy.

J. V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago